34448

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* JOHN AAGE NIELSEN

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* THE WARDROBE BOOKS OF KING EDWARD III OF ENGLAND, 1359-1377.

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Ph. D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1977

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. F. D. BLACKLEY

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 18 October 1977 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* John A. Nielsen

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ*
115 GARNET CRESCENT
SHERWOOD PARK, ALBERTA.
T8A 2S3

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (3/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE WARDROBE BOOKS OF KING EDWARD III
OF ENGLAND, 1359 - 1377

by

(C) JOHN A. NIELSEN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE WARDROBE BOOKS OF KING EDWARD III OF ENGLAND, 1359 - 1377 submitted by JOHN A. NIELSEN in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

F. D. Blackley
. . . .
Supervisor

W. J. Jones
. . . .

Raymond J. B. Grant
. . . .

Carola M. Small
. . . .

M. Crowder
. . . .
External Examiner

Date . . 12 October 1977 . . .

To Rosemary

ABSTRACT

The king's household in medieval England was primarily responsible for feeding and sheltering the king and his court, but because of their intimate association with the king the major household officials could be employed by him in the general administration of the realm. Considerable work has been done on the intrusion of the household into national affairs. No attempt, however, has yet been made either to reconstruct the internal and external operations of the household or to illustrate typical household receipts and expenses over a considerable period of time during the reign of Edward III. This thesis sets out to do this through a close examination of the contents of the last five surviving wardrobe books of the reign of Edward III for the period 1359 to 1377. At the beginning of this period the household was greatly involved in affairs of state; afterwards it was concerned mainly with domestic duties. All the accounts may be found in the Public Record Office in London. They are as follows: E 101/393/11 - the account of William de Farley for the period 3 November 1359 to 7 November 1360; E 101/396/2 - the account of William de Gunthorpe for the period 1 February 1366 to 31 January 1367; E 101/396/11 - the control-book of John de Ypres for the period 13 February to 27 June 1360 of the keepership of Thomas de Brantingham; E 101/397/5 - the account of Henry

de Wakefield for the period 28 June 1371 to 27 June 1373; and E 101/398/9 - the account of Richard de Beverley for the period 25 November 1376 to 26 July 1377.

The introduction provides a brief outline of previous work done on the royal household, of Edward's activities during the five accounting periods, and of the careers of the keepers and controllers in question. The chapters of the thesis analyze in turn the ledger-headings (or _tituli_) found in the various accounts. The _tituli_ of receipts are discussed first, then the expenditures. Most of the household's income came from the exchequer. The _tituli_ of expenditures include those listing the costs of feeding and sheltering the court, alms and gifts granted by the king, wages paid to huntsmen and falconers, and the fees and robes issued to household servants. The conclusion summarizes the types of information to be found in a household book. These particular accounts reveal very little about the king himself; rather, than expenses recorded in them generally resulted from the running of a domestic organization. There are two appendices. The first summarizes the duties and responsibilities of the principal officers, departments, and offices of the household; the second contains tables of the receipts and expenses recorded in the accounts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
INTRODUCTION 1
I *RECEPTA SCACCARII* 16
II *RECEPTA FORINSECA* 41
III *DEBITA* 56
IV *HOSPICIUM* EXPENSES 70
V *ELEMOSINA* 92
VI *VESSELLAMENTA ARGENTI* 122
VII *NECESSARIA* 125
VIII *EMPCIO EQUORUM* AND *RESTAURUM EQUORUM* 150
IX *FEODA, ROBE, ET CALCIATURA* 161
X *DONA* 187
XI *NUNCII* 205
XII *VADIA VENATORUM ET PUTURA CANUM* AND *VADIA FALCONARIORUM ET PUTURA FALCONUM* 216
XIII *VADIA GUERRE* 226
XIV *VADIA PACIS* 242
XV *PRESTITA ET REMANENCIA* 248
XVI *VESSELLAMENTA* 260
CONCLUSION 274
WORKS CITED 283
APPENDIX I: THE DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF VARIOUS HOUSEHOLD DEPARTMENTS 289
APPENDIX II: THE HOUSEHOLD'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES 307

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I HOSPICIUM EXPENSES 74

II THE PERCENTAGE DIVISION OF THE DAILY HOSPICIUM EXPENDITURE 81

III SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD STAFF AND EXPENDITURE AS RECORDED IN FEODA ET ROBE 173

IV CHANGES IN NUMBERS OF VARIOUS GRADES OF NAMED PERSONNEL 176

V DAILY RATES OF WAR WAGES IN FARLEY'S ACCOUNT . . 231

VI FARLEY'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES 310

VII GUNTHORPE'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES 311

VIII YPRES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES 312

IX WAKEFIELD'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES 313

X BEVERLEY'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES 314

INTRODUCTION

The king's household in medieval England was the organization which arranged for the feeding and sheltering of the king and his court. While this was its primary function, because of their intimate association with the king the major household officials could be employed in the general administration of the realm. The household itself could act, if required, as something more than the domestic organization of the king.

The intrusion of the household into national administration depended upon circumstances, such as expediency, factional strife, or foreign war. During the reigns of Edward I and Edward II, the household, or more specifically the wardrobe, the financial department of the household, upon occasion could supplant the exchequer as the financial department of the realm despite baronial objections. However, by the beginning of the period under consideration in this study, the latter years of the reign of Edward III (1359-1377), the exchequer's superiority in financial matters was a recognized fact. The wardrobe could and still did assist in organizing and equipping an army and act as a war treasury if the king was personally involved, but as Edward's reign drew to a close the king became sedentary, perhaps even senile. With Edward no longer able, or perhaps even inclined, to play an active role in government or foreign affairs, his household became restricted to purely domestic concerns.

The five household books of Edward III which are the subject of this study are all from the latter part of the king's reign. In the first of these, and to a lesser extent in the fourth, the household is concerned with the war in France because of the king's personal participation. The others record only the domestic administration of the household which looked after the needs of an aging monarch.

Considerable work, especially by Thomas F. Tout,[1] has been done on the role played by the king's household and its principal officers in the general administration of the realm. Following Tout's lead, some work has been done on the household's internal administrative procedures.[2] However, little work has been done on the domestic functioning of the household.

The king's household had to account to the exchequer for its receipts and expenditures. The household's accounts were drawn up for such an accounting. The head, or keeper, of the wardrobe, who was also called the treasurer of the royal household, prepared these accounts normally on a yearly basis, or for a lesser period if his keepership ended less than a year after the last account. Together with the keeper's account there went to the exchequer an exact copy made by the controller of the wardrobe, the keeper's subordinate. This copy, or control book, was made, not as a guard against mistakes, but as a guarantee that the controller approved of, and testified to, the contents of the keeper's account. Four of the accounts to be discussed are the accounts of the treasurer of the household; the fifth is a control book, a duplicate of the treasurer's lost account.

Household accounts, or wardrobe books, contain the household's itemized financial statement for the particular periods covered. They record the details of the money received by the household and how that money was used.[3] These accounts were submitted to the exchequer for audit. The exchequer made summaries of the accounts in appropriate rolls,[4] but also preserved the actual accounts and control books for future reference, a number of which have survived.

Information from the surviving accounts and control books has been utilized, especially by Tout. Household accounts of royal personages and others have been used to illustrate their travels and personal tastes.[5] Very few excerpts from royal wardrobe books have been published. The only complete one published is the Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobe anno regni Regis Edwardi primi vicesimo octavo for 1299-1300, edited for the Society of Antiquaries in 1787. Archaeologia contains scattered fragments of other accounts, as does Tout's Chapters. Two, at least, of Edward III's wardrobe accounts, covering the periods 25 November 1341 to 10 April 1344 and 25 November 1376 to 26 July 1377, have been partially transcribed as parts of theses.[6] A few accounts of queens have also been printed. One for queen

Isabella, wife of Edward II, was transcribed and translated by Frank D. Blackley and Gustav Hermansen.[7] Alec R. Myers has printed several fifteenth-century accounts.[8] Household accounts of other royal personages have also been edited, as have those of some magnates and bishops.[9]

Although household accounts have been utilized and excerpts from them published, no attempt has yet been made either to reconstruct the internal and external operations of the household or to illustrate typical household receipts and expenses during the reign of Edward III. The present work sets out to do this by studying in detail the contents of the last five surviving wardrobe books of the reign of Edward III covering the period 1359 to 1377.

These five accounts are used partly because they are fairly closely related in time. They record the receipts and expenses for a total of just over five years out of an eighteen year span. In addition, during this particular period the household played its last great role in affairs of state. Thus, the accounts under discussion cover a period of transition in the history of the household; before 1359 the household staff, in addition to ordinary domestic duties, routinely played a part in the national administration of the realm, and many of its chief officers went on to become the king's great ministers, but after 1377 the household was strictly limited to its role as the domestic organization which took care of feeding and housing the king. The present accounts illustrate both roles and provide examples of the types of revenue received and expense[1] incurred by the household in both roles.

The accounts to be considered have been employed for a variety of purposes, particularly by Tout in his Chapters. Many, indeed most, of the important or interesting examples of receipts and expenses have been culled from the accounts to illustrate particular points various authors have wished to make. In order to achieve the objective of this work, a study of the working of the household, many of these examples are repeated and so are some of the conclusions of others. Further illustrative material from the accounts is used. Some examples might be viewed as being of minor significance; some are of antiquarian interest only. Material of this sort has been ignored by historians such as Tout who have been concerned only with one aspect of the household's activities, its intrusion into national affairs. However, in order to obtain a complete picture of the household as it functioned and to understand its accounts, attention must be paid to all of the entries in the wardrobe books. . The accounts are thus being used in a new way for a new purpose, a purpose requiring the use of both seemingly insignificant entries and those of major importance.

The five household accounts are all preserved in the Public Record Office in London, England. They are, in chronological order:

I. P.R.O. E 101/393/11 - the account of William de Farley[10] from 3 November 1359 to 7 November 1360, the entire period of his keepership. The exchequer enrolled account containing the summaries made from the account at the audit is in P.R.O. E 361/4/3. The wardrobe book contains 126 folios. A prefatory statement reveals that the account was submitted to the exchequer by Farley himself on 12 May 1361. John de Uppingham acted as attorney for Farley and William de Humberstane for William de Clee, the controller.

The accounting period includes the Rheims campaign of Edward III and the ratification of the Treaty of Brétigny at Calais in October 1360. Farley was responsible for all expenses incurred in France during his keepership and those in Calais, where the household was stationed after the end of the campaign. He was also responsible for household expenditures in England incurred during his keepership before the king returned home in the latter part of May 1360. On 26 May 1360 Edward established a second household organization under William de Ferriby, who became responsible for expenses in England. Thus there arose the unique situation that between May and November 1360 there existed simultaneously two royal households. Ferriby's account has not survived.

II. P.R.O. E 101/396/2 - the account of William de Gunthorpe[11], for the period 1 February 1366 to 31 January 1367. The controller was Hugh de Segrave. The exchequer summaries are in P.R.O. E 361/4/10. The wardrobe book, containing 60 folios, deals strictly with domestic expenditures. This and the next account also contain the expenses of Philippa's household, which had been merged with that of the king.

III. P.R.O. E 101/396/11 - the control book or duplicate household account kept by John de Ypres,[12] controller of the household, for the period 13 February to 27 June 1369. The wardrobe book of the keeper, Thomas de Brantingham,[13] has been lost. This account will be called Ypres' account, not Brantingham's, since it is the control book that was used for this study. The enrollment of Brantingham's account is in P.R.O. E 361/4/19. The account contains 25 folios and was delivered to the exchequer by Ypres himself on 27 April 1370.

Because the control book was not the account audited by the exchequer, none of the receipts and expenditures were totalled, and no notations were made, by the auditors.

The expenditures recorded in Ypres' account are of a strictly domestic nature. The period of the account includes a recurrence of the Black Death.

IV. P.R.O. E 101/397/5 - the account of Henry de Wakefield[14] for the period 27 June 1371[15] to 27 June 1373. Ypres was still the controller. The exchequer enrolled account is found in P.R.O. E 361/4/22. The account contains 90 folios. It covers two years and includes the expenses of Edward's final involvement in the French war, his unsuccessful attempt to cross the Channel in an expedition designed to relieve the siege of La Rochelle in 1372.

Although the account covers two years, it is in fact composed of two successive yearly accounts bound together. The expenses, except for the Prestita et Remanencia, were recorded on a yearly basis. The receipts from the exchequer for both years were recorded together in chronological order; foreign receipts for the two years were also recorded together, although some were listed on an annual basis.

V. P.R.O. E 101/398/9 - the account of Richard de Beverley[16] for the period 25 November 1376 to 26 July 1377. William Street was the controller. The exchequer enrolled account is in P.R.O. E 361/5/18. Beverley's wardrobe book contains 40 folios, and is the last one for the reign of Edward III. The king died on 21 June but, following a common practice in the fourteenth century, his household was maintained for a month following the death to wind up its affairs and to play a part in the funeral of the dead monarch.

The wardrobe books record the household's receipts before the expenditures. Most of the receipts came from the exchequer and these are listed first under the titulus, or ledger heading, Recepta Scaccarii. Receipts from other sources, called foreign receipts, follow under an appropriate titulus. Expenditures are then recorded under various ledger headings, depending upon the nature of the expense or how it was incurred. The wardrobe distinguished between two types of expenditures, those resulting directly from the daily task of feeding and lodging the king and those not so arising. The former and known as hospicium, or household, expenses, the latter as foreign expenses. After the expenses, three of the accounts have an inventory of the plate and other valuables in the possession of the household, such as articles belonging to the king's chapel.

The order in which the tituli of receipts and expenses are recorded is identical in the accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley. The two earliest accounts, those of Farley and Gunthorpe, do not contain all of the tituli of expenses found in the other accounts, nor are the tituli recorded in the same order. The names and order of the tituli appearing in each individual account can be seen from the tables of receipts and expenses recorded in Appendix II.[17]

The study which follows will deal with each titulus in turn, in the order in which they occur in the three accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley. By examining in detail each titulus, and the entries in it, the nature of the wardrobe books and the types of receipt and expenditure to be found in them will be fully revealed, while the methods of accounting used and the functions of the royal household will be illustrated.

The accounts record expenses dealing with commodities or activities under several tituli when modern accounting procedure might record them in one titulus only. For example, expenses dealing with wine and the king's butler occur in four different tituli (Elemosina, Necessaria, Dona, and Prestita et Remanencia), but they were incurred in different ways and the keepers therefore recorded them under different headings. Farley and Gunthorpe similarly spread expenses concerning horses over several tituli. Confusion and repetition caused by variations in the recording of expenses in the accounts studied have, it is hoped, been overcome to some extent by amalgamating the discussion of certain topics somewhat arbitrarily under one heading. For example, horses are largely dealt with under the discussion of the tituli Empcio Equorum, but with appropriate cross references to the tituli in which they are actually mentioned. Every attempt has been made to keep repetition to a minimum but some could not be avoided.

The roles and functions of the various departments and offices of the royal household to some extent have been dealt with by J. H. Johnson in "The King's Wardrobe and Household".[18] Appendix I[19] of this study contains a brief outline of the duties and responsibilities of the principal officers, departments, and offices of the royal household.

Place-names and surnames have been treated according to certain principles. The spellings of the former have been modernized. When a place has not been identified, the Latin has been given and underlined, as in the case of Trowanseingeorge. Where the Latin of the manuscripts is quoted, place-names have not been extended since a number of extensions are possible even when the place is well known. Thus Calais is given as Cales', London as London', and Dover as Dovorr'.

The names of some 450 persons are presented in this thesis. In order to treat them consistently, the manuscript spellings of surnames have been retained, even in instances where the modern spelling is obvious, as in the case of William de Notyngham. The manuscript spellings of what appear to be surnames of occupations are also retained, as for example Margery Botelmaker, who provided the household with bottles. The only exceptions to this policy occur in the cases of important personages and of Edward's chief household officials and administrators where modern usage has been followed. If more than one spelling occurs, the more prevalant one is used. In instances where a person is named twice and the spellings differ, both forms have been given, as for example Richard Englissh (or Englisse).

It was found impossible to extend or translate several words, all of a technical nature. In each case, however, the general meaning is clear from the context of their use in the manuscripts. One of these, cuu', is clearly a measure of wine, and a second, Flurr', is a type of wine.

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

[1] *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, 6 vols. (1920-33; reprint, New York, Barnes and Noble, 1967).

[2] See Charles Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., vol. VI (1923), pp. 50-72; J. H. Johnson, "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward II", *ibid*., 4th ser., vol. XII (1929), pp. 75-104; J. H. Johnson, "The King's Wardrobe and Household", *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336: Volume I - Central and Prerogative Administration*, James F. Willard and William A. Morris, eds. (Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America, 1940), pp. 206-49.

[3] The accounts do not contain the total costs of the victuals and stores used in the household. Anything received as a gift or coming from royal manors or huntsmen were accepted into the household "without price" (*sine precio*). Since such commodities cost the household nothing, they could not be recorded as expenditures when actually consumed.

[4] The enrolled accounts repeat the details of the wardrobe Books for only four ledger headings or *tituli* - the *Recepta Scaccarii* (Receipt of the Exchequer), *Recepta Forinseca* (Foreign Receipt), *Prestita et Remanencia* (Prests and Remainder), and *Vessellamenta* (Plate). For other *tituli* only the total receipt or expenditure is recorded, although some enrolled accounts give only the total expenditure.

[5] For example, Hilda Johnstone, "A Year in the Life of King Henry III", *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. XCVII (1923-24), pp. 314-33; Doris L. Ufflemann, "A Great Lady and Her Travels in the Thirteenth Century", *ibid*., vol. XCIX (1925), pp. 218-30; and Margaret W. Labarge, *A Baronial Household of the Thirteenth Century* (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, (1965), "Eleanor de Montfort's Household Rolls", *History Today*, vol. XI (1961), pp. 490-500, and "The Spice Account: From Eleanor de Montfort's Household Rolls", *ibid*., vol. XV (1965), pp. 29-38.

[6] Agnes L. Colton, "Wardrobe Account of Edward III, November 25, 1341, to April 10, 1344, Preserved in the Public Record Office, *Miscellaneous Books of the Exchequer* No. 204. Text, Notes, and Introduction" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, 1939), which transcribes only the *Elemosina* (Alms), *Dona* (Gifts,) *Necessaria* (Necessities), *Nuncii* (Messengers), and *Jocalia et Vessellamenta Recepta* (Jewelry and Plate Received); and John A. Nielsen, "The Wardrobe

Account of Richard of Beverley for the Fifty-First Year of the Reign of Edward III of England" (unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1968), which transcribes and translates all but the daily household expenses. This latter account is one of the wardrobe books discussed in the present study.

[7] *The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II (8 July 1311 to 7 July 1312)* (Edmonton, University of Alberta Press, 1971).

[8] "The Captivity of a Witch: The Household Accounts of Queen Joan of Navarre, 1419-21", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. XXIV (1940), pp. 263-84, and vol. XXVI (1941-42), pp. 82-100; "The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou, 1452-3", *ibid.*, vol. XL (1957-58), pp. 79-113, 391-431; and "The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-7", ibid., vol. L (1967-68), pp. 207-35, 443-81.

[9] For example, Hilda Johnstone, "The Wardrobe and Household of Henry, son of Edward I", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. VII (1923), pp. 384-420; Joseph Burtt, "Account of the Expenses of John of Brabant and Thomas and Henry of Lancaster, 1292-3", *Camden Society*, old series, vol. LV (1853) (*Camden Miscellany*, vol. II); and John Webb, "A Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, During part of the Years 1289 and 1290", *Camden Society*, vols. LIX (1854) and LXII (1855).

[10] Farley (Tout, *Chapters*, IV, pp. 136-43) had been engaged in wardrobe work from approximately 1340. On 21 April 1358 he was made controller of the wardrobe, a post which he held until 3 November 1359. As controller Farley had to assume a major rôle in the preparations for Edward's Rheims campaign, because the keeper, Henry de Walton, was seriously ill. When Walton died, Farley succeeded to the keepership. On 1 July 1361 Farley was appointed constable of Bordeaux, the financial officer of Gascony, commencing his duties on 20 September. Farley died on 11 September 1362.

[11] Gunthorpe (Tout, *Chapters*, III, p. 261 n.5; IV, pp. 154-55) had been presented to livings in the king's gift in 1361. He was made keeper of the wardrobe on 1 February 1366 and held that office until 12 February 1368, when he was appointed treasurer of Calais, exchanging offices with Thomas de Brantingham. Gunthorpe remained treasurer of Calais until 26 September 1373, when he was named a secondary baron of the exchequer; he resigned this post on 2 November 1387. He died on 15/19 September 1390 (John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541; Vol. VI - Northern Province (York, Carlisle and Durham)*, compiled by J. M. Horn (London, Institute of Historical Research, 1963), pp. 88-89).

[12] The Ypres family were prominent in the service of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. John de Ypres (Tout, Chapters, III, p. 234; IV, pp. 157-59) had been a member of Gaunt's retinue since 1362; in 1367 he served under Gaunt in the Nájera campaign and was knighted by the duke before the battle. Ypres maintained his close attachment to Gaunt even after he was appointed controller of Edward's wardrobe on 13 February 1368. Ypres was the first layman to be made controller, a post which he held until 24 November 1376. From 2 July 1376 to 21 June 1377 Ypres was steward of Edward's household. Simultaneous tenure of these two offices was unusual.

[13] Brantingham (Tout, Chapters, III, pp. 225, 261) was a member of a family greatly involved in Edward's service. By 1349 he was a favourite clerk. At some point before 5 October 1359 he was made cofferer of the wardrobe, a position which he occupied during Edward's Rheims campaign. Brantingham's activities as paymaster and treasurer of the army made him virtually treasurer beyond the sea. His post as cofferer ended on 21 February 1361, when he was made treasurer of Calais, a position which he retained until 13 February 1368; he was then appointed keeper of the wardrobe, succeeding William de Gunthorpe. Brantingham was keeper until 27 June 1369, when he became treasurer of the exchequer. He was treasurer until 27 March 1371, and again from 10 July 1377 to 1 February 1381. On 12 May 1370 Brantingham had been consecrated bishop of Exeter. He died on 23 December 1394 (Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae; Vol. IX - Exeter Diocese, compiled by J. M. Horn, p. 2 and n.1).

[14] Until 1364 Wakefield (Tout, Chapters, III, p. 233; IV, pp. 153-54) had been a clerk of Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford; thereafter, he rose rapidly in Edward's service. He was keeper of the wardrobe from 12 June 1369 to 13 October 1375. On 28 October 1375 he was consecrated bishop of Worcester. Wakefield was treasurer of the exchequer from 14 January to 19 July 1377. He died on 11 March 1395 (Frederick M. Powicke and E. B. Fryde, eds., Handbook of British Chronology (2nd ed., London, Royal Historical Society, 1961), p. 261).

[15] The daily household expenses actually commence on 28 June.

[16] Beverley (Tout, Chapters, III, pp. 329-31; IV, pp. 192, 313) was a member of a family active in the services of both John of Gaunt and the king. He was clerk of the spicery, a household office, in 1361-62, a point hitherto unnoticed (see P.R.O. E 361/4/7r). On 13 April 1369 he was appointed cofferer of the wardrobe, a post which he held until 16 July 1376. On 25 November 1376 he became keeper of the wardrobe, succeeding William de Moulsoe who died in office, and remained

keeper until the household was dissolved. Beverley disappears after this, although he may be the man of that name who became keeper of Gaunt's wardrobe. He died before 17 October 1390 (Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae; Vol. I - Lincoln Diocese, compiled by H. P. F. King, p. 51).

[17] See pp. 310-14.

[18] The English Government at Work, pp. 206-49. Johnson's discussion is based upon Thomas F. Tout, "The Household Ordinances of Edward II", The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1915), pp. 267-318. The household organizations of Edward II and Edward III were apparently alike. The household ordinances of Edward IV quote from lost household ordinances of Edward III and these glimpses of Edward III's household ordinances indicate that the lost ordinances of Edward III were very similar to the surviving ones of Edward II (see Alec R. Myers, ed., The Household of Edward IV - The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478 (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1959), p. 19 and Appendix II).

[19] See pp. 290-306.

CHAPTER I

RECEPTA SCACCARII

The titulus Recepta Scaccarii (Receipt of the Exchequer) records the money received by the household, directly or indirectly, from the exchequer.[1] Normally, the household was expected to obtain all its funds from the exchequer. The household possibly had a definite income. Wakefield's account shows that on 13 December 1371 the household received £1,000 from the exchequer "against the expenses of the king's household in payment of that £200 ordered for each week for the expenses of the said household".[2] However, this is the only reference to an assigned weekly sum in the accounts being studied, and the sum of £10,400 yearly was certainly insufficient for the household's needs.[3]

Upon authorization from the chancery or privy seal office,[4] the exchequer placed large sums at the disposal of the keeper of the wardrobe. The exchequer paid out this allocated money in small sums either to the keeper or to various household officials, or, as was more common, to household creditors presenting proper authorization. These payments were usually sums of cash, but they could also be in the form of assignments upon local revenues. When presented with an assignment tally, a local official handed over the stipulated amount and obtained in return the tally as a receipt for that payment.

When the local official presented his accounts to the exchequer, the money paid in response to such tallies was credited to him. When assignments were in favour of the wardrobe, a local official often had to obtain from the keeper proof in addition to the tally or writ of assignment that he had paid the stipulated sum. This proof could take the form of a letter _amicis_, a letter patent of the keeper of the wardrobe, which stated that the money had been received.[5] Money paid to household officials or creditors, either in cash or by assignment, was recorded in the exchequer issue rolls as payments to the household.[6] To ensure that it might know what sums were paid on its account, the wardrobe kept a roll, copied from the issue rolls, of such exchequer payments. This roll became the basis of the wardrobe book's _Recepta Scaccarii_.[7]

Entries in the _Recepta Scaccarii_ state that the household's receipts came "from the treasurer and chamberlains" (_de Thesaurario et camerariis_), although most items in the last half of Farley's lengthy _titulus_ omit this phrase, or the phrase _de eisdem_ ("from the same"), perhaps in the interest of space and brevity. Several accounts add that the treasurer and chamberlains issued the money "by their own hands" (_per manus proprias_) or "by the hands" (_per manus_) of subordinate officials. Many items state that money was received "by the hands" of someone. Although the term _per manus_ cannot necessarily be taken at its face value,[8] it would appear that if the exchequer issued money "by the hands" of a household official, such sums were direct payments to the household. However, if money was received "by the hands" of a non-household official, then the exchequer presumably was satisfying a household debt.

Entries in the Recepta Scaccarii follow a chronological order. Although items in other tituli are dated by the particular regnal year, those in the Recepta Scaccarii are entered according to the system used by the exchequer in the issue and receipt rolls. The exchequer year, or period of account, lasted from one Michaelmas (29 September) to the next, irrespective of the regnal year,[9] which for Edward III was from 25 January of one year to 24 January next. The exchequer year was further subdivided into two terms: Michaelmas and Easter. Entries in the exchequer's issue and receipt rolls and in the household's Recepta Scaccarii were similarly subdivided. When an exchequer term fell entirely within the regnal year, the regnal year applying was used. During Edward III's reign this was the case for Easter term, which extended from the Monday after Low Sunday to Michaelmas. Michaelmas term, which lasted from the Morrow of Michaelmas, or the day after if that were a feast day or Sunday, to Easter, straddled the end of one regnal year and the beginning of the next.[10] According to exchequer practice Michaelmas term was dated by the later year.[11] For example, Wakefield's Recepta Scaccarii contains some household income originating in Michaelis Anno .xlvj.to. These receipts are dated from 2 October to 30 March,[12] that is, Michaelmas term for 46 Edward III extended from 29 September 1371 to Easter 1372, yet Edward III's 46th regnal year commenced on 25 January 1372.

The Recepta Scaccarii of Farley, Gunthorpe, and Beverley have entries outside the nominal accounting periods. In the case of Farley and Beverley this is owing to exceptional circumstances (which also clarify the large receipt in Farley's account). Farley was responsible for all the expenses incurred during the campaign of 1359-60 in France and during the peace negotiations in Calais. Many of these expenses, such as war wages and wages of peace, occurred beyond the actual accounting period. Since many of the exchequer receipts were payments of such expenses, Farley's receipts also extend beyond the period of account.[13] Indeed, most of his receipts originate after the conclusion of the nominal accounting period.[14] Beverley's receipts extend beyond the accounting period because he was in charge of Edward's funeral expenses.

The first two entries in Gunthorpe's account antedate the accounting period by half a year; both state that money was received from the exchequer by the hands of William Street, the king's butler. He received £3,000 on 15 July 1365 and £400 on 26 July. There is no apparent reason why these receipts should be included in Gunthorpe's account. This is the only money paid to the butler in the account.

The entries in the Recepta Scaccarii state that money was issued by the treasurer and chamberlains. All the accounts refer to sums of money issued per manus proprias of the treasurer and chamberlains. This suggests that the senior officials personally paid out the money concerned. However, only two entries in Ypres' account support this assumption.

The first item in Ypres' Recepta Scaccarii, dated 21 February 1369, states that £1,000 was received from the treasurer and chamberlains "by their own hands in money received at the receipt of the exchequer", that is, at the lower exchequer. On 10 April, £666 13s.4d. was obtained "from the same, in money received from the same treasurer and chamberlains by their own hands".

In Ypres' account the majority of the wardrobe receipt from the exchequer came per manus proprias of the treasurer and chamberlains. In Gunthorpe's account such receipts account for some three-fourths of the total, in Beverley's for approximately two-fifths. Such receipts are rare in the other two accounts.

If a lesser exchequer official, normally a clerk, issued money, this fact was recorded, except in the case of Farley's account. His account seldom identifies the agent, or agents, by which money was issued. Wakefield's account contains items stating that the treasurer and chamberlains issued money by the hands of William York and Thomas Grace, their clerks.[15] On 20 July 1372 the two clerks, under this formula, issued £1,333 13s.4d. for a variety of secret provisions for the war. A similar item, dated 18 November 1371, states that £200 was received against household expenses from the treasurer and chamberlains "by their own hands. . . by the hands of their clerk, Thomas Grace". It would thus appear that a per manus issue, and even a per manus proprias issue, by the treasurer and chamberlains need not be made by them personally, but could be made by another exchequer official.

Generally, money issued to the household by the exchequer was entered in the Recepta Scaccarii as being received by someone, such as household officials. On 25 June 1372 the treasurer and chamberlains, by the hands of Adam de Hertyngdon, one of the chamberlains, issued £14 to William de Humberstane, Senior, clerk of the avenery. However, payments recorded as being made to the chief household officers (the keeper steward, controller, or cofferer) are unusual. Aside from Farley's account, only the controller and the cofferer are named as obtaining money. The controller appears receiving money once in both Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts; the cofferer is found only in Wakefield's account, although upon four occasions. For example, William Street, controller in Beverley's account, received £666 13s.4d. against household expenses on 10 December 1376.

The absence of the steward's name under normal conditions is understandable. Although he and the keeper audited the accounts of the various household departments, the steward was more involved with the maintenance of discipline and the enforcement of household regulations than with finance. Lord Guy de Brian, steward in Farley's account, did receive some £1,200 on 15 February 1361 for his and others' expenses, when they remained in Calais to provide for the safe custody of the king of France, but these circumstances were unusual.

The Recepta Scaccarii of the various accounts do not mention that the keeper of the wardrobe himself received money from the exchequer. Considerable evidence, however, suggests that he did.

The Necessaria of Gunthorpe's account shows that he was sent out of court to London on 18 occasions to fetch money (pro denariis querendis).[16] The Recepta Scaccarii of the same account records 11 occasions on which money was issued to the household by the treasurer's and chamberlains' own hands. Of these payments, 9 were within periods when Gunthorpe was out of court. For example, he was sent from Windsor to London for two days between 7 and 15 May 1366 to get money. The Recepta Scaccarii notes that on 11 May £1,000 was issued to the household by the hands of the treasurer and chamberlains. In addition, two entries stating that money was received by a tally from the exchequer fall within periods when Gunthorpe was out of court.

One of these reveals that on 26 November 1368 £362 3s.5d. was received from the exchequer by a tally charged against

Master Bernard Brocas. The Necessaria shows that Gunthorpe was in London on two occasions between 21 November and 20 December, remaining there for 7 days.

Gunthorpe's is the only account which links the absences of the keeper from the household with issues of money in cash or by assignment to the household. But the information provided by that account seems to show that the keeper himself upon occasion got money for the household's needs. Perhaps he usually did so, unless stated otherwise.

Farley's account records payments that were definitely made to the keeper, as well as to the controller, the cofferer, and the steward. The payment to the latter, lord Guy de Brian, has already been discussed. The payments to the others are also of an unusual nature. Farley received £40 against the expenses of the household in going to Calais.

Issues of the exchequer to the household were made per manus of persons other than household members.[17] These probably were household creditors, having either sold something to the household or performed some service, in return for which they had been given household debentures or bills, instruments to authenticate the amounts of money owed to them.[18] The debenture, or bill, was presented to the exchequer, which paid the amount owed, either by cash or by assignment. For example, William Chesthunt and John Priour, neither of whom were household members, received almost £21 against some unidentified office on 22 February 1361. Apparently whatever was involved was not carried out; Priour was charged with a prest for the amount at the end of the accounting period.

All the accounts record that the exchequer delivered money to the king's butler.[19] His task was that of supplying the household with wine; issues for the purchase of that commodity appear in the Recepta Scaccarii. For example, Wakefield's account shows that the king's butler, later the household controller, William Street, received £1,333 6s.8d. on 11 December 1371, by the hands of his clerk William Garlethorp, against the purveyance of wine for the provisions of the household. Most items, however, merely state that the money was provided against the office of the butler and received directly from the exchequer. Ypres' account shows that Street was paid £200 on 5 March 1369 by the exchequer against his office. The butler received payments from the exchequer by assignments in Wakefield's account. On 31 January 1372 Street received £30 by a tally charged against John de Thorp, knight; on 12 February £1,000 was delivered to Street for his office by William Balsham, clerk, collector of customs and subsidies in the port of Boston.

In Farley's and Wakefield's accounts, the household received money by the hands of the keeper of the great wardrobe. No explanation is apparent for Wakefield's account, but for Farley's it was because the great wardrobe temporarily accounted to the wardrobe of the household.[20] There is only one such entry in Wakefield's account. It states that on 16 April 1373 the exchequer paid 400 marks to Richard de Beverley, the cofferer, £100 to Robert de Whitbergh, the almoner, and 100 marks to John de Sleaford, the keeper of the great wardrobe, all for the expenses of the household.[21] John de Newbury received some £3,170 in 20 payments in Farley's Recepta Scaccarii. Much of this was described only as against his office, as was the case with the £1,163 he received on 11 October 1360. However, some of the money went to officials of offices subordinate to the great wardrobe. Thus, on 12 December 1359 Newbury received 100s. per manus Gerard le Heaumer, smith of the king's armours. Henry de Snaith, clerk of the privy wardrobe, Hugh Penitour, king's painter, and Thomas de Thorneton, king's pavilioner, also received sums of money in this manner. Quite possibly most of Newbury's receipts were connected with Edward's campaigning in France. However, on 6 October 1360 Newbury received repayment of the £11 9s.11d. he had paid to Adam de Pulleteria, the king's surgeon; on 4 November he received, by writ, 50s. against his wages.

The Recepta Scaccarii of Farley, Ypres, and Wakefield contain examples of assignments upon local revenues, although the one item in Ypres' account does not state against whom the tally was charged. Wakefield's account shows that on 18 November 1371 £200 was received against household expenses by a tally charged against the alien priory of Ogbourne St. George. Two other payments against household expenses were made from the farm of the alien priory of Frampton. Alien priories were seized by the crown when war between England and France broke out again in 1369.

Assignments by tallies charged against the collectors of customs and subsidies, and against sheriffs, occur in the accounts of Farley and Wakefield. Wakefield's account shows that on 8 November 1371 £120 was received by John de Conyngesby, purveyor of the household, by a tally charged against John de Beverley and John de Stalham, collectors of customs and subsidies in the port of Great Yarmouth. In Farley's Recepta Scaccarii, almost £27 was received by a tally charged against William Appolderfeld, sheriff of Kent. In the same account, an exchequer issue by bill of £200 by the hands of the collectors of customs and subsidies in the port of Southampton was presumably also an assignment.

Several items in Farley's account state that the exchequer issued assignments per litteram amicis. Local officials making payments to household officials in response to writs or tallies of assignment were occasionally required to provide additional proof that the payment had actually been made. Letters patent, or letters amicis, of the wardrobe keeper fulfilled this role. Such letters started with the word "amicis" and were addressed to the treasurer and chamberlains; they stated that the keeper had received the stipulated sum from the person concerned.[22]

Assignment per litteram amicis could be made with or without tallies. On 30 November 1360, for example, Nicholas Stucle, sheriff of Cambridgeshire, was charged with a tally *per litteram amicis* for nearly £29. John de Hampdon, sheriff of Bedfordshire, on 4 February 1361 was charged with about £7 *per litteram amicis*. In a similar manner, Richard de Eccleshale, treasurer of Calais, was charged with some £2,370 on 26 February 1361.

Normally, entries in the *Recepta Scaccarii* give some indication why the exchequer issued money to the household or its creditors.[23] The most common reason given, in all but Farley's account, is that the payment covers the expenses, or provisions, of the household (*super expensis hospicii Regis*).[24] For example, in Wakefield's account £133 6s.8d. was received on 1 July 1371 at the king's lodge of Guildford by the hands of Thomas de Swaby. It seems probable that in many instances payments *super expensis hospicii* are identical with payments *pro officio suo* ("against his office").

A few entries give some indication of the nature of the household expense. Payments for victuals occur in the accounts of Farley and Wakefield. Farley records that on 13 October 1360 some £14 was paid Robert Furneaux for victuals. Some victuals purchased, or purveyed, upon occasion are specified. Fish are most commonly mentioned. Wakefield's account reveals that John de Conyngesby, sergeant, purveyor of the household, received £200 from the collectors of customs and subsidies in the port of Great Yarmouth, to purvey fish.

An even fewer number of entries are more specific. Farley's account reveals that on 22 July 1360 Margery Botelmaker was paid £7 5s. for bottles, and Nicholas Peautrer £4 4s. for plate of pewter. In Gunthorpe's account, Roger Slak was paid £26 for 3 casks of honey purchased for the stores at Windsor Castle; in Wakefield's, William de Humberstane, Junior, clerk of the spicery, was paid £48 for spices purchased from Bartholomew Myne, a Lombard.

Normally, the accounts do not mention the purchase of wine because wine was provided by the king's butler. However, Farley records an example of such a purchase because during his accounting period the butler accounted to the keeper of the wardrobe. On 7 November 1359 the exchequer issued some £225 for 23 casks of wine purchased at Sandwich from Peter Johannis, a Spanish merchant (mercator Hispann').

Both Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts contain expenses dealing with plate. The item in Gunthorpe's Recepta Scaccarii states that on 22 October 1366 the sum of £613 was received by the hands of Helming Leget, receiver of the king's chamber. This was paid to Thomas de Hassey, king's goldsmith,[25] for fashioning a large goblet, two pots, and a ewer, all of pure gold, for the king's household.[26] In Ypres' account, £39 10s.4 1/2d. was paid in the value of old silver plate, weighing £30 8s. in goldsmiths' weight,[27] sold to Joan de Hassey, widow of Thomas de Hassey.[28] Possibly this was a theoretical "sale"; Joan may have made new items for the household out of the old plate. The value of the old plate would be deducted from her bill for the finished products. In both instances, it would appear that money listed as an exchequer issue on the household's behalf passed only nominally through the exchequer.

Several accounts include payments for horses, as distinct from war horses which will be discussed below. In Beverley's account, a total of £72 13s.4d. was so expended by the hands of Robert Bardolf.[29] Farley's account shows that Thomas de Brantingham, cofferer, received £66 13s.4d. by a writ of the privy seal and an indenture, for horses purchased from Wolfardus Gistell for the king's use.

Receipts from the exchequer for military campaigns are found in the Recepta Scaccarii of both Farley and Wakefield. Farley covers the period of the campaign of 1369-60, Wakefield the unsuccessful attempt of Edward III to relieve La Rochelle. Since Wakefield's account contains fewer receipts, it will be discussed first.

The household under Wakefield received just over £5,000 from the exchequer for military expenditures. For example, on 20 July 1372 £1,333 6s.8d. was received by the hands of Thomas Grace and William York for undisclosed secret war provisions.

Payments for war wages[30] appear in Wakefield's Recepta Scaccarii. The Vadia Guerre[31] has only one item showing that Hugh and John Fastolf, with others, guarded one of Edward's ships on its voyage between 28 October and 5 December 1371 from Kirkelrod' to London. The two Fastolfs received £26 13s.4d. on 27 October; the final £70 19s. was paid at the exchequer on the authority of a bill, enrolled on 12 February 1372.

Wakefield's account contains other entries dealing with war wages, but the expenses appear to have been incurred prior to the present accounting period. On 31 October the exchequer paid £100 to household esquires and yeomen for wages and expenses while guarding a ship. John de Appulby, scullion, and four unnamed archers received from the exchequer on 4 February 1372 a tally charged against the sheriff of Oxford and Berkshire for £14 3s.8d. for unpaid war wages. Similarly, Guy de Brian, the former steward of the household, received payment of £39 15s.6d. by a bill cancelled on 11 February 1372.

The household purchased war horses during the period of Wakefield's account.[32] On 5 March 1372 £96 2s.7d. was delivered to Thomas Spigurnell for the purchase of such horses at Stamford Fair. Similarly, Thomas de Stafford received £100 on 29 April 1372 from the collectors of customs and subsidies in the port of Kingston-upon-Hull.

Farley's is the only other account to include exchequer payments for war expenses. Since he was responsible for all expenses incurred by the household on the continent, much of the receipt in his Recepta Scaccarii clearly deals with expenditures in France. Two entries have already been mentioned - the expenses of the household going to Calais and those of the steward guarding the captive king of France. On 3 August 1360, and twice on 24 August, William de Clee, the controller of the household, received almost £310 against the expenses of the king.

Several unusual entries are dated 15 February 1361. Money was obtained by a privy seal writ and an indenture, generally of the recipient. The only other use of this procedure was for the purchase of horses. Thomas de Brantingham, cofferer of the household, received at Bruges two sums totalling £4,666 13s.4d. from the ransom of the king of Scotland by the hands of John Maleweyn, governor of the liberties of the English merchants at Bruges, and Richard de Eccleshale, treasurer of Calais. Farley received £666 13s.4d. for his office from the same ransom from the same two men. William Graunson, banneret, received £200 from the same two men from the ransom of the duchy of Burgundy.

Prests[33] for war wages are the most common issues from the exchequer in Farley's account. The _Vadia Guerre_ includes in the term "war wages" not only wages proper but also special rewards, compensation for horses lost, and transportation of horses to and from Calais.

Generally, only important individuals received prests. These included most of the high ranking English nobles who accompanied Edward, such as Edward, prince of Wales, John of Gaunt, earl of Richmond, Lionel, earl of Ulster, and Henry, duke of Lancaster.

Most prests were issued prior to the commencement of Farley's accounting period. Many of these prests were granted before the persons' military service began but some were granted afterwards. A few prests were issued after Farley's account had started.[34]

The earl of Ulster received a prest for £401 17s. on 11 August 1359. The Vadia Guerre shows that the earl was in service from 6 September 1359 to 30 May 1360, and that his total war expenses amounted to £1,239 15s.8d. The earl received all but 2d. of the remaining money on 9 March 1361.[35] Richard de Ask began his military service on 9 September 1359 but obtained a prest of money on 4 October. Lord Aymer de Sancto Amando received a prest for war wages of £166 10s. on 7 February 1360. He was in military service from 1 September 1359 to 1 June 1360.

Except for these prests, only one entry dated within Farley's accounting period states that an issue was for war wages. Frank van Hale received £359 9s. on 5 May 1360 for such wages. He served Edward between 23 August 1359 and 26 May 1360.[36]

It is of interest that of about 145 continental mercenaries named in Farley's Vadia Guerre, only a few seem to have been paid by exchequer issues. Frederick van Peghwencle was owed war wages of some £160 for the period 4 October 1359 to 24 May 1360. He received £33 6s.8d. "against his fees", the only use of this phrase, on 21 August 1359. However, he was charged with a prest for this same sum at the end of the accounting period.[37] It must be presumed that the mercenaries were paid in some manner. Probably they were paid by the wardrobe; this is suggested by several prests charged against them which note that the money received, and for which the recipient had to account, had been received from the keeper.[38] It is possible that the large sums mentioned earlier[39] as being received by the keeper and cofferer from the ransoms of the king of Scotland and the duchy of Burgundy were used for this purpose.

With the exception of the prests described above and wages paid to hunters and falconers discussed below, only 13 entries in Farley's Recepta Scaccarii state that exchequer issues were for wages. Most of these issues were subsequent to the period of hostilities. Only one of the 13 entries, the war wages mentioned earlier paid to Frank van Hale, specifies the type of wages involved. However, the wages paid to other individuals appear to include war wages, wages of peace, and regular household wages.

Lord William Heron seems to have been paid war wages. The Vadia Guerre shows that he earned £47 3s.4d. as a soldier. He was paid this sum in equal installments of £23 11s.8d. on 19 June and 1 July 1360. Henry Molineux, king's archer, who appears in both the Feoda et Robe and the Vadia Pacis, was owed £6 8s.6d. for wages of peace from 1 June 1360 to 12 February 1361. He received £4 19s.4d. on 19 June 1360 and £4 19s.4d. on 20 February 1361. The latter payment seems to have been for his wages of peace; the former may have been for regular wages, robes, and footwear. Thomas de Keynes, almoner, who appears neither in the Vadia Guerre nor the Vadia Pacis, received £10 for robes and wages on 3 November 1360. These wages must have been regular wages.

The Recepta Scaccarii of Farley's account contains some payments for hunters and falconers. Hunters and falconers accompanying Edward on his campaign in France appear in the Vadia Guerre, but most of these are not mentioned in the Recepta Scaccarii. William Boys, a yeoman hunter, however, is found in both tituli. He was owed about £18 10s. in war wages, food allowances of dogs, and footwear allowances. The Recepta Scaccarii records 10 money payments to him totalling some £20 10s. He thus received more than he was owed, at least in Farley's account. Since he was not charged with a prest for an overpayment, the difference may represent a sum owing to him from the previous accounting period.

In many cases, hunters and falconers who received money in the Recepta Scaccarii appear only in the Feoda et Robe and the Vadia Falconariorum, which record only amounts owing to them. Such men must have been drawing regular household wages and allowances. William de Troye was paid sums owing for his wages and food allowances, but did not receive payment for his robe allowance. The wages and food allowances entered in the Vadia Falconariorum are often divided into several different periods, and many men receiving payment did so for only the last of these, the final few months of 1360. For example, Robert de la Rivere's wages and food allowances were over £24 for the period 3 November 1359 to 11 November

1360, and 53s.9d. for the period 12 November to 24 December. He was paid the latter sum only, and a 40s. robe allowance in February 1361. Why this was so in his, and other cases, is not explained.

While most items in Farley's Recepta Scaccarii provide no reason for exchequer issue, some must have been payments of wages and allowances. When an individual receiving an exchequer issue also appears among the tituli of expenditures, such as the Feoda et Robe, the Vadia Guerre, or the Vadia Pacis, it is likely that the payment was for money owing him. In general, however, individuals received less money than was due.

In summary, the titulus Recepta Scaccarii records money received by the household from the exchequer. The exchequer could either issue money directly to the household, or to a household officer, or it could issue it indirectly by paying debts owed to household creditors. For the most part, the exchequer paid cash, but it made the occasional assignment upon local revenues. Generally, the receipt from the exchequer was used for the ordinary needs of the household, whether the money went directly or indirectly to the household.

The household in time of war, however, was used for other than domestic purposes. Wakefield's account contains a few receipts pertaining to war expenditures; the majority of Farley's receipts appear to be connected with the hostilities in France.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1] The receipts from the exchequer are: Farley - £108,624 5s. 7 1/2d.; Gunthorpe - £18,472 3s.5d.; Ypres - £3,779 10s.4 1/2d.; Wakefield - £31,003 14s.1 1/2d.; and Beverley - £7,885 19s. 4d.

[2] ". . . super expensis hospicii Regis in persolucionem illarum .CC. li ordinatam pro qualibet Septimana pro expensis dicti hospicii . . ." (f. 2v). This £200 per week may be similar to the fixed sum (the certum) of 10,000 marks yearly received by the chamber during the last twenty years of Edward's reign (Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 313-18). Although there appear to be some instances when the chamber did not receive all of this money, there are many cases where the chamber receipt exceeded the certum.

[3] The average daily household expenditures from the tables in Appendix II, pp. 310-14, are: Farley - £437 10s.10 3/4d.; Gunthorpe - £74 2s.5 3/4d.; Ypres - £71 12s.7 3/4d.; Wakefield (both years) - £54 15s.11 1/2d.; and Beverley - £54 13s.3 1/2d. The number of days covered are given on page 71-75, although for Farley the period in which no Hospicium was recorded has been included, for a total of 369 days. The weekly £200 was even insufficient to cover the Hospicium expenses (see p. 75).

[4] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 231-32, and Tout, Chapters, II, pp. 96-97; III, p. 70 and n. 1. The privy seal office was an independent office of state, but its former connection with the household is seen in the fact that its personnel still received their fees and robes from the household.

[5] See below, p. 26 and p. 38 n.22.

[6] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 231; Tout, Chapters, II, pp. 99-101.

[7] Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward I", p. 57; Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward II", p. 81.

[8] See Anthony Steel, The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1377-1485 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954), pp. 379-80. and Martin M. Crow and Clair C. Olson, eds., Chaucer Life-Records (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1966), pp. 143-44.

[9] See Henry G. Richardson, "The Exchequer Year", Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th ser., VIII (1925), pp. 171-90, and IX (1926), pp. 175-76; and Tout, Chapters, I, pp. 40-41, and II, pp. 97-98.

[10] Richardson, "Exchequer Year", T.R.H.S., VIII (1925), pp. 176,181; Tout, Chapters, II, p. 97 and n. 3. During these terms there were vacation periods when the exchequer was "closed", although some clerks were present to carry on any business which might arise (see James F. Willard, "The Observance of Holidays and Vacations by the Lower Exchequer, 1327-1336", University of Colorado Studies, vol. XXII (1934-35), pp. 281-87. Some examples from the present accounts of receipts during vacation periods are given below, n. 12, and pp. 25-26 and p. 38 n. 21.

[11] Richardson, "Exchequer Year", T.R.H.S., VIII (1925), pp. 179-82.

[12] The one item dated 30 March (the previous item being dated 13 March) falls 2 days after Easter Sunday (28 March). This item is unique in showing a receipt during Easter week, part of one of the exchequer's vacation periods (Tout, Chapters, II, p. 97 n. 3). Part of the payment was by the hands of Edward's almoner, the remainder by the hands of Thomas Grace, suggesting that two payments were made at the same time. Ordinarily, two receipts on any one day would have been the subjects of separate entries.

[13] See p. 301.

[14] Of the entire exchequer receipt, only £14,273 18s. was obtained during the accounting period. A total of £30,079 9s.4 1/2d., mostly as prests, was received before the nominal commencement of the account, and £64,270 18s.3d. was received after the accounting period had ended.

[15] Almost two-thirds of the entire receipt passed through their hands.

[16] See pp. 127-28.

[17] For the purpose of this work, a household member is defined as a person who appears in the Feoda et Robe (Fees and Robes), although not all servants are listed in that titulus (see pp. 162-63, 217). In addition, not all the persons listed in the Feoda et Robe were technically household servants (see above, n.4, and pp. 172, 174). In this work, the words serviens, scutifer, vallettus, pagettus (or pagius), and garcio have been

translated as sergeant, esquire, yeoman, page, and groom respectively.

[18] But for two examples in Wakefield's, Farley's is the only account to mention that exchequer payments were made in response to bills (per billam, de billa sua, or in persolucionem bille sue). He seldom provides a reason for exchequer payment. Presumably, those wardrobe bills authenticating the household's indebtedness stated the reason for the debt, so that one would not be required in the account.

[19] For his duties see pp. 141-42. These receipts amount to about £5,000 in Farley's account, £3,400 in Gunthorpe's (see above, p. 19), £300 in Ypres', some £3,400 in Wakefield's, and some £1,400 in Beverley's.

[20] See pp. 138-41.

[21] This receipt is dated the day prior to Easter Sunday, which was part of the exchequer's Lent vacation (Tout, Chapters, II, p. 97 n.3; see above, nn. 10, 12).

[22] See James F. Willard, Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property, 1290 to 1334 (Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America, 1934), pp. 262-63, 262 n.5). Several entries in the Debita per Billas show that debts were owed per litteram amicis (see p. 57). This might suggest that household debts or exchequer issues per billam and per litteram amicis were equivalent. The transitory phrase per litteram amicis, or per litteram de amicis, was apparently used by the exchequer between 1361 and 1370 to describe a variant of this type of letter. Buyers of tallies and bills of assignment, that is, persons who purchased them at a discount from the original recipients, provided the exchequer with problems. In order to ensure that such buyers had the right to receive payment for such tallies or bills, the exchequer demanded what in effect were letters of reference or proofs of purchase. If new tallies were cut or new bills drawn up, they were described as being issued to the recipient per litteram amicis, since he was not the original creditor (Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer , pp. 380-81). Because of the nature of Farley's responsibilities it would not appear that this usage of the phrase per litteram amicis is meant in the Recepta Scaccarii, although this may be the meaning in the Debita.

[23] For Farley's account, see above, n. 18.

[24] In Gunthorpe's and Beverley's accounts, some three-fourths of the entire Recepta Scaccarii is of this sort, including practically all of the receipt by the hands of the treasurer and chamberlains. Almost two-thirds of the entire receipt from the exchequer in Wakefield's account was against the provisions of the household. Some seven-tenths of this total was received by the hands of the exchequer clerks William York and Thomas Grace. It is likely that the money in Ypres' account, issued by the treasurer and chamberlains' own hands (some nine-tenths of the total receipt), is of this sort.

[25] Hassey was one of the four annually elected wardens of the goldsmiths' company of London in 1353-54, 1356-57, and 1363-64 (Thomas F. Reddaway and Lorna E. M. Walker, The Early History of the Goldsmiths' Company, 1327-1509 (London, Edward Arnold, 1975), pp. 324-25). Wardens enforced the guild regulations and standards and tried offenders.

[26] See p. 263.

[27] See pp. 122, 124 n.2.

[28] See pp. 264, 272 n. 10.

[29] See pp. 152-53.

[30] Receipts for wages appear only in Wakefield's and Farley's accounts. Farley mentions both regular and war wages, Wakefield only war wages.

[31] See p. 226.

[32] See pp. 153-54.

[33] For prests, see p. 248.

[34] See p. 232, and below n. 36. Some £30,000, mostly as prests, was received prior to the accounting period (see above, n. 14). To this must be added the prests against war wages totalling almost £13,650 issued by Henry de Walton, the former keeper (see pp. 43, 53 n.6).

[35] Although the arithmetic in these accounts is very good, it is true that one cannot expect modern financial accuracy in medieval accounts (Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, pp. xxii-xxiii).

[36] Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 143 n.2) is substantially correct when he states that war expenses were "either paid in

advance of, or subsequently to, the actual operations", although the payments to Sancto Amando and van Hale show that they were also paid during the period of military operations (3 November 1359 to 18 May 1360). However, the receipt during the period was relatively small, amounting to some £7,600. Of this sum, £4,000 in four payments was received by the butler, John de Stodey. On 28 January 1360 the sum of £2,000 was issued to Henry Picard without any explanation. However, Picard was probably the London citizen who was Stodey's predecessor as king's butler, an office which Picard held between 29 September 1350 (Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, vol. VIII (1348-1350) (London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905), p. 570) and 30 September 1359 (ibid., 1358-1361, p. 272). Whatever the reason for the payment, Picard did not account for this sum in the wardrobe since it was charged against him as a prest at the end of the accounting period (see p. 255).

[37] See p. 256.

[38] Ibid.

[39] See p. 31.

CHAPTER II

RECEPTA FORINSECA

The second type of receipt recorded in the accounts is the Recepta Forinseca (Foreign Receipt). This titulus contains all those revenues not emanating directly or indirectly from the exchequer.[1] The origin of much of this receipt varies from one account to another; certain types of revenues occur regularly. Farley's account is unique in that, since his establishment was active only in France, it does not contain revenues, such as those received from the clerk of the market, which resulted from the king's household rights and prerogatives in England.

The most consistent source of foreign receipt is the value of stores and money remaining in the possession of the king's butler and department heads from the previous accounting periods. These receipts formed part of the Prestita et Remanencia (Prests and Remainder) of the previous wardrobe account.[2] Farley's account does not contain receipts of this type.[3] Entries recording the receipt by the hands of the king's butler note both the quantity and the value of wine. Gascon wine is most frequently mentioned, but stores of Beaune, Rhenish, Malmsey, Vernaccia, and Greek wine also occur. Entries for receipts of stores remaining in household offices generally cite only the value of "victuals" or "things" remaining from the former accounting period. Such is the case for the poultry, the saucery, and, in Wakefield's account, the larder. The latter office is mentioned only by Wakefield, apparently in place of the kitchen. In addition to "various items", specific stores are listed as remaining in some departments. Victuals remaining in the pantry, kitchen, and bakery include grain. The bakery also contains wood for the furnace. Wax, spices, napery, linen cloth, and canvas form part of the remainder of the spicery. The hall and chamber contain wood, the scullery wood and coal, and the marshalsea hay, oats, and harnesses. Ale and cider remain in the buttery; they constitute the entire remainder in Ypres' account. An interesting point is that wines remaining in the household are not said to be in the office of the buttery (which was responsible for serving the wine at meals), but in the possession of the king's butler.

Prests of money from the previous account are also listed as foreign receipts.[4] An entry in Gunthorpe's account states that some £165 for purveyances remained in the possession of several unspecified household officers; the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield indicate that the butler retained the unspent portion of the money he received for purchasing wine.[5] Such sums were unrealized expenditures in the previous accounting periods, and, in order to balance the accounts, had been charged as prests against the persons concerned. When the individuals accounted in a succeeding account, the sums were regarded as receipts by the household. Finally, Farley's Recepta Forinseca shows that £13,647 13s.10 1/2d., in the value of prests for war wages paid out, was received from Henry de Walton, the former keeper.[6] This sum, additional to other prests for war wages recorded in the Recepta Scaccarii, represents approximately two-thirds of Farley's entire foreign receipt.

The value of the increase of measure (incrementum mensure) of grain appears in the Recepta Forinseca of all the accounts, although income of this nature does not add materially to the household's receipts. It originated from the household's customary way of purchasing grain and beans; the household paid for 20 quarters, but actually collected 21, the extra quarter being the incrementum.[7] Possibly, the incrementum derives from the difference between the heaped measures used by the household to buy grain and the levelled or stricken measures employed for internal accounting.[8] For example, in the first year of Wakefield's account, Edmund Tettesworth, sergeant of the bakery and purveyor of grain, bought 1,393 quarters 3 bushels of grain and beans. The incrementum amounted to 69 quarters 5 bushels, and at a value of 6s.11 1/4d. per quarter (plus 8 1/2d. to the total) the profit was £24 3s.11 1/2d. During this year grain was also bought for the war, resulting in a profit of some £8. The incrementum ranged from some £5 in Farley's account to about £47 in Gunthorpe's.

The clerk of the market, who also served as the coroner of the household, accounted to the keeper of the wardrobe for the profits of the court of the marshalsea.[9] These profits are a regular source of the household's foreign receipt, although they do not appear in either Farley's or Ypres' accounts. In Farley's case, there were no profits, presumably because of the unusual circumstances prevailing during his keepership, in Ypres' because his account covers only half a year. The profits of justice were divided into those resulting from the pleas of the hall and those from the pleas of the market. They were valued, respectively, at about £45 and £175 in Gunthorpe's account, about £145 and £135 in Wakefield's, and about £25 and £15 in Beverley's.

Profits resulting from the sale of prise wines by the king's butler occur in the Recepta Forinseca of all the accounts but Ypres'; this was due, perhaps, to the short accounting period of the latter. The taking of prise wines refers to the king's right to demand as a form of customs tax one cask of wine from ships carrying ten or more, and two casks from ships carrying twenty or more.[10] Wine merchants were paid nominal sums for wine taken; the accounts indicate that 15s. was paid for each cask of prise Gascon wine taken in the port of Bristol, but 20s. per cask in other English ports.[11] In Farley's account £9 was received from the sale of prise wines in Bristol, £111 from sales in other ports. It is not certain whether these indicate gross or net receipts.

There is more precision in the other accounts. In Gunthorpe's the sale of 106 casks of prise wine in various English ports realized £571 6s.8d. However, the costs of these prise wines, amounting to £96 (40 casks were taken in Bristol and 66 in other ports), are recorded in the Necessaria, so that the actual receipt was only £475 6s.8d. Gunthorpe records the gross receipt; Wakefield and Beverley give the net receipt, deducting the purchase costs before listing the income. For instance, Beverley shows that 32 casks taken in Bristol and 66 casks taken elsewhere were sold for £444 8s.4d., yielding a profit of £354 8s.4d. The sale of prise wines resulted in a profit of almost £470 in Wakefield's account.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts record other sorts of profit from the sale of wines. Three such items are entered by Farley. The sale of 24 casks of Gascon wine received by the butler from Walter de Heywood, sheriff of Southampton, yielded £72; 127 casks of white Gascon wine forfeited at Dartmouth were sold for £338 13s.4d., and 2 pipes of Rhenish wine were sold for £8 14s.2d. However, the last two examples are partly book-keeping entries. The Necessaria[12] states that the 2 pipes of Rhenish wine had been purchased at £19 3s. They were sold, presumably because they were spoiled. Therefore, there was a loss of £10 8s.10d., not a gain. Furthermore, the Necessaria records that the household had paid the butler £181 6s.8d. for 68 casks of white Gascon wine, part of the forfeited consignment mentioned above. Therefore, the household could include as a foreign receipt the value of wine sold to itself. The true receipt was £157 6s.8d. Gunthorpe records that £213 8s.4d. was realized from the sale of 78 casks 1 pipe of Gascon wine which had spoiled. In reality, there was no receipt since the *Necessaria* reveals that £259 17s.5 1/2d. was lost in selling the wine. The sale of deteriorated stock also appears in the accounts of Wakefield and Beverley, but they eliminate cross-entries by giving a resumé of the transaction and by recording only the net loss in the *Necessaria*.

Although the sale of stores generally resulted in a loss, two accounts record true receipts. In Wakefield's account William de Humberstane, Junior, clerk of the spicery, purchased spices in Cornwall valued at £83 9s.7d. They were unused, and later spoiled. Nevertheless, the spices were sold for a profit of £58 6s.1d. Thomas de Bernolby, clerk of the pantry and buttery, paid £39 17s.11 1/2d. for grain, wine and ale, but he later sold these stores at a profit of £10 8s.4d., for "the voyage of the Flemings across the sea" (*pro viagio Flemyngorum supra mare*).

Certain items which were formerly the fees of household officers were sold "for the king's work" in Ypres' account and the revenues recorded in the *Recepta Forinseca*. Thus, 56s. was received from Thomas de Bernolby, clerk of the buttery, for the sale of 39 empty wine casks and 6 empty wine pipes, formerly the fees of the sergeants of that office. The sale of fat and "other things" from the kitchen and of old carts and harnesses from the avenery resulted in revenues of over £5. It is not certain why the sale of these fees appears only in Ypres' account; their absence from the other accounts might suggest that the abolition of such fees was not permanent.

Nearly all the accounts record as foreign receipts the value of victuals received from royal servants, although only in Farley's and Gunthorpe's does this add significantly to the total foreign receipt. Farley shows that almost £1,200 in Gascon wine was received from lord Roger Bromley, keeper of the king's victuals in Honfleur, by the hands of John de Stodey, the king's butler. John de Middleton, keeper of the king's victuals in Calais, provided flour, oats (for horses), and wine valued at slightly over £325 during Edward's stay in Calais. In Gunthorpe's account 10 barrels of salted eels from Merke and Colne, valued at just over £8, were received from Thomas de Brantingham, treasurer of Calais. For purveyances of salmon from the Tweed, £118 6s. was received from the collectors of customs and subsidies in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The last entry illustrates the receipt of money from local officials, transactions which normally went through the exchequer.[13] Presumably, the drawing upon local officials did not originate with the exchequer, so that the transaction would not be entered in the Recepta Scaccarii. In Ypres' account William de Gunthorpe, treasurer of Calais, provided 10 barrels of salted eels valued at slightly over £6; Nicholas de

Louthe, the receiver of Edward's money in the county of Ponthieu, provided one barrel of oil from nuts, purchased in France, valued at 60s. The latter also provided 10 salted deer and 24 salted boars and wild sows "without price" (sine precio). This term means that they cost the household no money.[14] Also listed as sine precio is the verjuice or wine vinegar received by the household from royal vineyards and gardens. Ypres', Wakefield's, and Beverley's accounts show that verjuice from the vineyard in Windsor Castle was received from Adam de Hertyngdon, clerk of the king's works.[15] He provided 4 pipes in Ypres' account, 8 pipes (each pipe containing 100 gallons) in Wakefield's, and 5 casks in Beverley's. Similarly, Wakefield records that Robert Vinour, king's gardener, provided 224 gallons of verjuice from the gardens of Eltham, Rotherhithe, and Sheen. The accounts do not say what use was made of the verjuice although it is possible to make some suggestions. Verjuice may have been used as a food perservative; it seems definitely to have been used in the making of sauces since it was received into the household in Beverley's account by Robert Certesey, sergeant of the saucery.[16]

The Recepta Forinseca of Farley's and Ypres' accounts includes the amount of the restitution made by persons losing pieces of plate. This restitution took the form of "selling" the plate to the person who lost it. The Vessellamenta (Plate) of both accounts note the losses.[17] Farley records an income of this type of just over £42 from five persons, ranging from the £36 16s.8d. paid by Walter de Conton, sergeant of the scullery, for silver plates, to the 7s.11d. paid by Robert Chivall, a yeoman of the king's "secret family" (secreta familia), for 5 silver spoons. Ypres shows that over £13 was received from 6 men. However, in this account most of the money had not been received by the end of the accounting period because 5 of the men were charged with prests in the Prestita et Remanencia for the value of the plate lost.

Other foreign receipts concerning plate are found in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts. The former records as a receipt the value of the plate recovered by John de la Lee, the steward, from that stolen by Peter Say. The latter was hanged for his crime. The stolen plate, belonging to both Edward and Philippa, weighed £12 2s.11 1/2d. by goldsmiths' weight, but the value of the 44 pieces of broken silver recovered, that is, the receipt, was only £11 14s.9 1/2d. Since the inventory of plate makes no mention of it, the theft presumably took place during some previous accounting period. Gunthorpe also lists as a receipt the sum of £99 14s.4 1/2d., realized from the sale to Thomas de Hassey, king's goldsmith, of plate weighing £76 14s. 1/2d. The inventory of plate notes which items were sold. The value of plate purchased from the executors of the testament of Thomas Cheyne is listed as a receipt by Ypres. The plate weighed £145 14s.11d., resulting in a receipt of £200 13s.9d. However, the cost of buying this plate is found among the expenses under the heading

Vessellamenta Argenti (Plate of Silver).[18]

Money obtained from Richard de Ravenser, the receiver of queen Philippa's revenues, adds considerably to the foreign receipt of Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts. Ravenser paid £10 per day into the king's wardrobe to cover the expenses of the queen's household during the period (1362 to 1369) in which her establishment was incorporated with her husband's.[19] Gunthorpe's account has nine such payments made by indented acquittances totalling £3,650, one-third of the foreign receipt. Ypres records only one payment of £1,350, which represents almost one-quarter of the entire foreign receipt.

Three accounts record miscellaneous, yet important, sources of foreign receipt. Farley shows that almost £5,000, or about one-quarter of the foreign receipt, resulted from ransoms and profits on exchange of currencies. Almost £3,000 was received in ransoms. About £950 came from the ransom of the duchy of Burgundy by the hands of William Graunson, banneret; £2,000, in the form of 12,000 crowns *Philipp'*, came from the burgesses of the city of Paris by the hands of Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick.[20] The remainder derived from the ransoms of two churches in France, of which only one is identified. The *Recepta Forinseca* says that 200 fleeces, valued at £40, were received by the hands of lord Thomas de Dale from the ransom of the church of *Vescy* in Rheims. The household had not obtained this money by the end of the accounting period, since it was charged as a prest against Dale.[21]

The profits from the exchange of currencies added almost £2,000 to the household's coffers. For example, 20,347 nobles 1 farthing of gold were received at 6s.8d. each and sold at 9s. apiece, resulting in a total profit of £1,356 9s.8d. Over £90 originated from the money received and paid during Edward's presence at Calais for the peace negotiations.

Well over one-quarter of Gunthorpe's foreign receipt came from Henry de Snaith, the clerk of the great wardrobe. William de Humberstane, clerk of the spicery, received almost £2,390 from Snaith in the value of wax, napery, linen cloth, canvas, spices, and "other things". Gunthorpe's is the only account to list this type of receipt. Finally, Beverley's account shows that some £1,450, well over one-third of the foreign receipt, was obtained from Philip la Vache, the receiver of Edward's chamber, against the expenses of Edward's funeral.

In summary, the Recepta Forinseca records that portion of the household's income which did not originate from the exchequer. The foreign receipt is of three types. First, there are those revenues appearing regularly; the most important sum is the value of the stores and prests of money remaining in the household from the previous account. Other revenues of this sort include profits from the sale of prise wines, receipts of victuals, the incrementum mensure, and the revenues from the clerk of the market. The second type of foreign receipt is that occurring from time to time. The most significant is the daily sum of £10 paid to the wardrobe by the queen's receiver in 1362-69. Restitution by household members for plate lost by them is found in several accounts, although this income is slight. The sale of deteriorated stores occasionally resulted in a profit. Finally, there are those sources of income unique to one account; these include the value of plate bought and sold. Most important, however, is the value of ransoms and profits of exchange of currencies in Farley's account, the value of stores received from the great wardrobe in Gunthorpe's account, and the money received from the chamber for Edward's funeral in Beverley's account. These sources of money added considerably to the foreign receipt in their respective accounts.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1] The totals are: Farley - £20,743 16s. 3/4d.; Gunthorpe - £10,688 17s. 1/2d.; Ypres - £5,903 3s.10 1/2d.; Wakefield - £6,490 13s.4 1/4d.; and Beverley - £3,643 6s.5 3/4d. The *titulus* of Wakefield's account covers two years, but some of the receipt, such as the *incrementum mensure*, the sale of prise wines, and revenues of the pleas of the hall and market, is recorded on a yearly basis, presumably because the person from whom the household received the money had to account every year.

[2] See pp. 249-50.

[3] The approximate values of such receipts are: Gunthorpe - £1,630; Ypres - £2,460; Wakefield - £3,840; and Beverley - £1,800. Of these sums, the value of the wine in the butler's possession and the victuals in the spicery and the kitchen (larder in Wakefield's account) makes up some three-fourths of the total value of the remainder.

[4] See p. 249.

[5] They amount to about £1,560, £1,850, and £1,730 respectively.

[6] The enrollment of Walton's account (P.R.O. E 361/4/3) states that Farley was charged with a prest totalling £13,753 9 1/4d., in the value of war wages, as well as "in the value of various victuals and other things remaining in the offices of the said household [and remaining] in the ships of the various offices". There is no explanation of what happened to the remaining £105 5s.10 3/4d., which perhaps represents the value of stores. Nevertheless, the enrollment states that Farley accounted to the exchequer for the entire amount.

[7] Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward I", p. 80.

[8] Labarge, *Baronial Household*, p. 73, and William Bray, "An Account of the Obsolete Office of Purveyor to the King's Household", *Archaeologia*, vol. VIII (1787), p. 339.

[9] For this court and the clerk of the market, see pp. 295-96.

[10] Labarge, *Baronial Household*, p. 108. The king's rights of prisage also included the taking of hawks and falcons (see pp. 133-34).

[11] The *Elemosina* and the *Necessaria* reveal that the market value of a cask of Gascon wine was £5 6s.9d. in Farley's account, £6 7d. in Gunthorpe's, £5 1s.6d. in Ypres', £8 8s.2 1/d. and £8 10s.6d. in the two years of Wakefield's, and £5 19s.2d. in Beverley's.

[12] See pp. 143-44.

[13] A similar item is found in Wakefield's account where £36 13s.4d. was received from William de Gunthorpe, treasurer of Calais, by the hands of Thomas de Spigurnell, against the purchase, in Calais, of horses for the king's use.

[14] Items *sine precio* were possibly listed as receipts (as opposed to gifts of victuals which were not) because they were subject to account and probably had been delivered into the household by indenture. Gifts and items *sine precio* were not included among the daily expenditures of the household offices, but the quantities of such commodities consumed were recorded in the margins of the preliminary rolls of the *Hospicium* expenses (see Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 219). However, Beverley's *Hospicium* expenses record the consumption of verjuice *sine precio* (see p. 88 n. 8).

[15] See p. 56. Presumably his duties as clerk of the king's works were performed by a deputy because Wakefield's *Recepta Scaccarii* describes him as one of the chamberlains of the lower exchequer (see p. 21).

[16] See also p. 88 n. 8.

[17] See p. 265.

[18] See Chapter VI.

[19] See p. 75.

[20] For this ransom, see Joshua Barnes, *A History of King Edward III* (Cambridge, 1688), p. 592. This £2,000 was apparently retained by the earl as part of his wages. He and his retinue earned regular war wages of £3,929 12s.8d., plus an additional £2,169 13s.6d. when the earl was the king's lieutenant in Normandy (see p. 232). The *Recepta Scaccarii* reveals that the earl received a total of £2,454 13s.6 1/2d.

The Debita per Billas contains debts owing to him of £1,475 18s.5 1/2d. and £169 13s.6d. The money actually given the earl and the first debt equal, within a pound, his regular war wages. The second debt appears to be money owed from the earl's wages as king's lieutenant in Normandy.

[21] See p. 255.

CHAPTER III

DEBITA

The accounts of Farley, Gunthorpe, and Beverley contain a final titulus of receipts, the Debita (Debts). A debt was an unpaid expense. When a retiring keeper drew up his last account, he listed the debts owed by the household at that time to avoid being charged with them later as a personal liability.[1] These debts were then taken over by the exchequer, which eventually paid them. Since the household was thus relieved of the responsibility for them, the amounts owing were considered as receipts from the exchequer.[2]

Although Gunthorpe's is not a final account, it does contain one debt entered under the heading Debita per Billam (Debts by Bill) at the end of the Recepta Forinseca. Adam de Hertyngdon, clerk of the king's works at Windsor Castle,[3] was owed £40. No reason is given for the debt; Hertyngdon does not appear elsewhere in the account. A marginal notation states that the debt was paid at the lower exchequer on 18 January 1369. Since its inclusion is a departure from normal practice, it may have been recorded by an exchequer auditor.

Ypres' account, the control book for the missing final account of Brantingham's keepership, contains no Debita. Presumably all debts had been settled when it was drawn up. However, Farley's and Beverley's accounts were final ones and both contain debts.

Farley's account divides debts into three categories - *Debita per Billas* (Debts by Bills), *Debita sine Billis* (Debts without Bills), and *Debita per Tallias* (Debts by Tallies). A debt without a bill appears to have been one contracted for special causes without the authorization normally required.[4]

The total debt in Farley's account is a very large amount, £31,431 12s.7d. Of this, £30,386 17s.7 3/4d. is found in the *Debita per Billas*. The debts by bills, of which some 330 are recorded, in the majority of cases were for very sizeable amounts, such as the £5,749 18d.[5] owed to the prince of Wales, but there were some small ones, such as the 4s.8d. owed Serlonus de Garderoba.

All the debts by bills were owed to named individuals with but 5 exceptions. These latter individuals were office holders, such as the constable of Langley, who was owed 27s., and the tithingman (*bursaldrus*)[6] of Pilleston, who was owed 26s.8d.

Despite the name, three debts in the *Debita per Billas* were owed *per litteram amicis*. Lord Edmund de Cornewaylle was owed £14 10s.6d., lord Roger de Brumlegh £39 8s. 3/4d., and John Landels £133 9s.10d. These men appear nowhere else in the account. Presumably the bills authorizing the expenses were not sufficient and so the debts were attested by the keeper *per litteram amicis*.[7]

The reason for a debt can be determined in one instance only. Thomas Broun was owed by bill £4 7s.8d. for victuals. Originally the debt had been listed in the Debita per Tallias, where it is stated that the money was for meat, but this entry had been cancelled with a marginal explanation that Broun "had a bill by the hands of Richard de Acton", who was a yeoman of the offices.[8]

Despite the lack of explanation, it is possible to suggest why some of the debts in the Debita per Billas had been contracted. Simon Barnet was owed 18s. for his robes and footwear, and this sum was listed as owing to him by bill. The debt of £57 given as owing to Alan de Heton, knight, is the same as his war wages; John Basset's wages of peace amounted to £8 11s., the same as the debt acknowledged as owing to him. It is unlikely that anything else was owing to Heton or Basset since neither was a household member nor do they appear elsewhere in the account. Edmund Rose was owed £406 11 3/4d. for war wages in the Vadia Guerre. The keeper acknowledged a debt to him of £446 9s.11d. The additional £40 7s. seems to have been spent by Rose for purchasing articles of clothing and other things.[9] A debt of £34 16s.8d. owed the queen by bill can only be a matter for speculation.

Generally, the amounts shown as owing to individuals in the expenses do not balance with those listed in the debts. John Asphull, a household servant, is shown in the expenses to be owed 18s. for robes and £6 16s.6d. for war wages. In the

Recepta Scaccarii he received £5. The Debita per Billas shows that a debt of £5 5s.2d. was acknowledged as owing to him, some £2 10s. more than expected. Asphull may have been owed something, such as for wages, from the previous account.

The Debita per Billas reveals that the exchequer eventually settled Farley's debts. A number are cancelled with marginal notations explaining that they had been paid at the exchequer. The dates of these payments range from 8 July 1362 to 17 October 1369, although several are dated only 43 Edward III (25 January 1369 to 24 January 1370). Debts, as is well known, could remain outstanding for years. For example, the money owed the queen was paid on 12 June 1363. The value of the debts cancelled ranges from the £5,563 5s.7d. paid Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, to the 40s. paid Richard Englissh (or Englisse). Almost £12,520 in debts are cancelled. Most of this money was received by English warriors, such as the duke of Lancaster, whose claims for war wages had not been settled when Farley rendered his account. A few creditors, such as Englissh, do not appear elsewhere in the account.

The debts cancelled in the Debita per Billas are summarized without any dates on an untitled folio at the end of the debts. A number of discrepancies, however, exist between the cancellations on this folio, which total some £12,830,[10] and those in the Debita per Billas, which, as has been seen, total approximately £12,520. For example, the Debita per Billas records a debt to John de Winwick, former keeper of the privy seal,[11] of £345 19s.2d. A marginal note explains that £28 13s.4d. of this debt was paid on 27 October 1363; the remainder was certified in the chancery on 12 April 1364 by a writ of the great seal. The summary shows the entire debt as paid.

The second titulus of debts in Farley's account is the Debita sine Billis. A total of £917 3d. was owed to 124 persons. The value of the debts range from £176 4s. owed lord de Gonny to the 20s. owed Master Richard Charles, the queen's butler.[12] Of the men named in the titulus, only 22 are found elsewhere in the account. Four of these were household servants. For example, Thomas Bray appears only in the Feoda et Robe, where he received an allowance for robes and footwear of 18s. However, the debt owed him was £4 12s.10d. Possibly, Bray was owed money for his robes and footwear and for wages. Such may also be the case for John Bonde, a yeoman of the office. Bonde was entitled to robes and footwear valued at 18s. and war wages of £6 7s.4d. He received £6 5s.4d. at the exchequer. A John Bonde figures in each of the tituli of debts. Bonde was owed £4 16d. by a bill, a debt cancelled on 14 October 1364. He was owed the same sum without a bill. This debt was certified on 3 November 1365 by a writ of the privy seal at the lower exchequer. Lastly, Bonde was owed 20d. by a tally for the office of the poultry. If all these entries refer to the same man, then Bonde alone is listed in each of the tituli of debts.[13] Broun, mentioned earlier, is the only verifiable name entered in more than one titulus of debts.

The remaining 18 individuals who can be identified in the expenses of the account are all continental mercenaries who also appear in the Vadia Guerre, such as lord de Gonny, mentioned above, who had earned £286 4s. in war wages. Lord Walrandus van Rode had his debt for £10 12s. certified at the lower exchequer on 8 December 1376.

Of the remaining 102 men in the Debita sine Billis, 96 were owed the sum of £4 16d. Despite the name of the section, two such debts were by bills. The sum seems to represent, from the frequency of its occurrence, a fixed payment that cannot be identified. With the exception of John Bonde, no person owed this sum in the Debita sine Billis is found elsewhere in the account. Sums of £4 16d. also occur in the Debita per Billas and the Recepta Scaccarii. John Broun, for example, who appears in the Vadia Guerre, received two such payments from the exchequer. Ralph Chaundel received £4 16d. from the exchequer "against the office of the saucery"; he is not found elsewhere in the account. Aside from Bonde, only one household servant either received or was owed £4 16d.; Peter Comer, ministrel, earned both war wages and wages of peace. He was owed sums of £4 16d. and £6 10s. by bills.

The final titulus of debts in Farley's account is the Debita per Tallias (Debts by Tallies). The debts include ones for grain, ale, and meat, and for the offices of the poultry and scullery; that is, the sums arose because of purchases made by and for the household. Each category includes at least one person owed several sums; there is no example of an individual listed in more than one category. Most debts by tallies were owed to officials of various places, such as constables, wardens, and tithingmen. This is the only titulus which records debts to women. The titulus lists 230 debts totalling £127 14s.8 1/2d., ranging from the 4d. owed the tithingman of Chilham to the £9 13s.4d. owed Peter Tidde.

There were 34 debts for grain, mostly to town officials; they range from the 14s.2d. owed the constable of Nevendon to the 113s.4d. due to the chamberlain of Middleton. Only named individuals were owed money for ale. The value of the 26 debts for ale range from 4s.4d. owed several persons to the 22s.2d. owed John Tarriere. The latter was also owed 13s.6 1/2d. One women, Matilda Personn, was owed 4s.7 1/2d. for ale. Nearly all 24 debts for meat were owed to named individuals. Debts ranged from the 2s. owed Henry Fode to the £9 13s.4d. owed Peter Tidde. One item pertaining to meat was crossed out; Thomas Broun's debt had been transferred to the Debita per Billas.[14] Most of the 143 debts for the office of the poultry were owed to local officials. They range between 4d. owed the tithingman of Chilham and the 18s.1d. owed the constable of Monkton. John Bonde, discussed earlier,[15] was owed 20d. There are 3 debts for the office of the scullery; William Bonette was owed two sums of 7s. each, and William Sonne 6s.5d.

Aside from Thomas Broun, whose debt was transferred to another section, the only person owed a debt by tally to appear elsewhere in the account is John Bonde. If all references refer to the same person, then his would be the only example of a household purchase from a household servant. Although this is not impossible, perhaps this Bonde is not the same individual appearing elsewhere.

Beverley's is the third account with a list of debts. The titulus covers a folio and a half and is entitled Debentur diversis creditoribus (Debts to Various Creditors); the first folio adds de civitate London' et patria (from the City of London and Countryside). Debts to private individuals, including women, are listed in the first folio; the second includes only those to household members. A total of £1,805 18s.6 1/2d. was owed 105 persons.

Debts totalling £1,154 17s.2d. are recorded to 76 non-household personnel. They range from the 4s.1d. owed Roger Cheldewell to the £264 14s.5d. owed Adam Carlill. Beverley does not state by what instruments debts were owing, but, in a manner similar to Farley's debts by tallies, money was owed for ale or fish, or for the offices of the spicery, kitchen, poultry, scullery, hall and chamber, or stable. Only two sections, dealing with debts for ale, record money owed to persons from outside London.

Debts for ale are listed for 34 Londoners; they range from the 9s.3d. owed 7 persons to the £122 8s.6d. owed Thomas

Godsire. Two other sections record debts for ale to persons from outside London. The first section, entitled "Wycombe for ale", records debts to 6 men, ranging from the 13s.10d. owed Stephen Safferon to the 47s.2d. owed John Jeky. Debts to Walter Sangehurse, John Faxland, and Henry Cok, totalling 11s.10d., are recorded in a section entitled "Windsor, Wandesworth, and Bernelines for ale". This section is crossed out with the marginal explanation: "because it was paid by Beverley".

Six debts are recorded for the office of the spicery, ranging from the £4 12s.6d. owed William de Wadesworth to the £264 14s.5d. owed Adam Carlill. In addition, John Pope and John Campion (or Campyon), were jointly owed £149 7s.7d. Although they were not household members, several individuals owed money for spicery expenses are mentioned in items of expenses pertaining to Edward's funeral. Thus, Pope and Campion,[16] chandelers of London, are noted in the Elemosina (Alms),[17] where they received payment for a hearse erected around Edward's corpse in St. Paul's Cathedral. Roger Chaundeler, owed £27 5s.8d. for the spicery, is also recorded in the Elemosina,[18] where he received payment for preserving the king's body from putrefaction. Apparently, Pope, Campion, and Chaundeler performed other services for the household, or were owed for materials purchased from them, since the debts listed exceed the money due them. The sum owed Wadesworth may represent an unpaid balance for medicines purchased from him during the king's illness.[19]

Money was owed 13 persons for the kitchen. Alice atte Cornere was owed 17s., the bailiff of Westminster £51 6s. An exchequer notation in the margin states that the latter debt had been cancelled "because it was satisfied by the abbot of Westminster in 2 Richard II". Only one other debt in the titulus is noted as paid, but, as mentioned below, several others were certified. It is unclear why exchequer notations were made for only a few debts, but it does not necessarily indicate that the other debts remained outstanding. Five debts are listed for the poultry; they range from the 29s.6d. owed William London to the £42 4d. owed William Cappe. Only two persons were owed debts for the scullery: Margaret de Kent 42s.4d. and Robert Russe 61s.7 1/2d.

Three persons, William Shrimpulmerssh, John Hasshurst, and John Prentys, were owed a total of £10 3s. for the hall and chamber. There were 6 debts for the stable, ranging from the 4s.1d. owed Roger Cheldewell to the £7 5s.5d. owed John Herberd. Finally, William Coles was owed £13 4s. and £4 18s.6d. for sea fish.

The final folio of debts in Beverley's account contains sums owed household personnel. These are divided into two sections. The first section is entitled Debentur diversis officiariis hospicii ad satisfaciendum toti patrie (Debts to Various Household Officers for Satisfying the Entire Country). Three debts are entered: Richard Fode, baker, was owed £22 16

1/2d.; Robert Mackeney, purveyor, £431 11s.3d.; and William Brantyngham, avener,[20] £49 2s.7 1/2d. The sums may refer to purveyances and goods purchased. A marginal note states that the names and sums were contained in three indentures, and were certified in the office of the privy seal by writs enrolled in the memoranda rolls of 3 Richard II. A marginal note referring solely to Brantyngham says that the debt was certified in the chancery by a writ of the great seal enrolled in the memoranda rolls of 3 Richard II.

The second section is entitled Debentur diversis creditoribus pro feodis vadijs et robis (Debts to Various Creditors for Fees, Wages and Robes). A total of £104 19s.5 1/2d. is recorded for 26 people, ranging from the 18s. owed John Burton to the £13 16s.8d. owed Master Adam Leche. Most names occur in the Feoda et Robe, but those which do not include that of John Wilton, minstrel, who was owed 38s.1 1/2d. In half of the items, the sum owed is equal to that listed in the Feoda et Robe, as is the case for Burton mentioned above, and for Richard Stury who received fees and robes totalling £8 13s.4d. Stury's debt was cancelled because it was paid in 2 Richard II. In some instances, the debts acknowledged as owing were larger than the sums listed in the Feoda et Robe. Such is the case for Stephen de Hadle, a yeoman of the household, who received robes and footwear worth 18s. However, the sum of £12 4s.11d. is listed as owing to him. This may well be an unpaid portion of the sum paid Hadle in the Elemosina for expenses incurred by him during the preparation of Edward's body prior to the funeral.[21] A marginal note says that his debt was certified in the chancery by a writ of the great seal in 7 Richard II.

In conclusion, debts acknowledged at the end of a keepership were amounts owed by the household, but because the exchequer assumed responsibility for their payment, the wardrobe viewed them as receipts. Marginal notations made by exchequer clerks indicate that the excheuqer was, in fact, settling debts years after the accounts had been rendered by the wardrobe keeper. In Farley's account, debts by bills and without bills could apparently represent sums owing for robes and footwear; for war wages, wages of peace, or regular household wages; or for articles purveyed by the household. Debts by tallies, on the other hand, seem to be amounts owing for items purchased or purveyed. Beverley's debts to non-household members are similar to Farley's debts by tallies. They reveal that debts could be not only for goods or materials purchased but also for services rendered. Finally, Beverley's list of debts owed household servants takes two forms. The debts owed the three household officers "for satisfying the whole country" appear to be money owed for purveyances or purchases for the household. Although the second section heading says that the sums were for fees, wages, and robes, the particular debt to Stephen de Hadle was apparently a portion of the expenses which he incurred while making arrangements for Edward's funeral.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1] See pp. 299-300.

[2] Tout seems not to have fully understood this practice. He excludes Farley's and Gunthorpe's Debita from the household's total revenues, but includes Beverley's as part of the Recepta Forinseca (Chapters, VI, pp. 90-95; see also Tables VI, VII, and X, pp. 310, 311, 314).

[3] See pp. 48, 54 n. 15.

[4] Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, p. 380.

[5] The sum of £6,749 1s.6d. given by Albert E. Prince ("The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign", Speculum, vol. XIX (1944), p. 154 n. 1) is incorrect.

[6] See borga in Ronald E. Latham, ed., Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources (London, British Academy, 1965), p. 53).

[7] See pp. 26-27, 38 n. 22.

[8] For tallies and bills, see pp. 297-98.

[9] See pp. 141, 236.

[10] The sums of £10,555 6s.10d. [the account reads £10,555 10s.10d.] given by Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 144, is a partial sum only.

[11] See p. 119 n. 23.

[12] See p. 251.

[13] See p. 63.

[14] See p. 58.

[15] See pp. 60, 61.

[16] While the latter is called William in the Elemosina, he is most likely the same man. Errors in first names, on the whole uncommon, do occur in the accounts.

[17] See p. 112.

[18] See p. 109.

[19] See pp. 132-33.

[20] For the duties of the avener, see pp. 292-93.

[21] See pp. 109-110.

CHAPTER IV

HOSPICIUM EXPENSES

The first section of expenses in the wardrobe books is that of the *Hospicium* (Household), although no title is given to them in any of the accounts.[1] Here are recorded the daily costs of feeding and housing the court,[2] as well as, upon occasion, some extraordinary expenditures incurred because of a military campaign or because of Edward's funeral. The *Hospicium* expenses are recorded on a daily basis, and each day's expenditure is entered in eleven categories - pantry, buttery, wardrobe, kitchen, poultry, scullery, saucery, hall and chamber, stable, wages, and alms.[3] No details are given;[4] only the total expenditure under each category and the total daily expense are recorded. These daily sums record the values of victuals and stores actually consumed (and other expenses actually incurred) on that day, regardless of when such commodities were obtained. Each side of the folios of the *Hospicium* expenses records one week's expenses, unless the account begins or ends so as to make this impossible.[5] The total weekly expense is recorded at the bottom, while every four weeks the total monthly expense is also recorded. The only exception is Ypres' counterroll which records no subtotals or totals.

Because of the nature of the *Hospicium* expenses, a detailed analysis of them is not possible. However, some general comments can be made on the total daily expenditure, and, later, on the eleven categories of expenses.

The *Hospicium* expenses constitute the largest single type of expenditure in the wardrobe books, with the exception of Farley's. Generally, the *Hospicium* expenses comprise more than half of the total expenditure made in the household.[6]

The total *Hospicium* expense recorded in Farley's[7] account is £8,554 6s. 1/2d., fluctuating from the £9 1d. on 1 July 1360 to the £217 17s.3 1/4d. on 13 October 1360. The average for the 344 days (1360 was a leap year) covered in this *titulus* is just over £24 17s.4d.

The wardrobe books normally indicate the daily location of the household, although the king was often absent from the household, being technically "out of court". Farley's account deviates from this practice, owing perhaps to the unusual conditions prevailing during his keepership, conditions which are discussed later. It is very likely that the wardrobe clerks were unable to ascertain the exact position of the household while Edward was on campaign.

The total *Hospicium* expense in Gunthorpe's account amounts to £17,545 4s.10d., ranging from the low of £27 6s. 1/2d. on Good Friday 1366 to the high of £255 4s.10d. on Christmas Day. This account covers an entire year (365 days) with an approximate daily average of £48 1s.4 1/2d. The household was stationed at Windsor from 1 February 1366 to 24 July; at Havering from 25 July to 10 September; at Clerkenwell on 11 September; and at Windsor from 12 September until 31 January 1367.

Ypres' Hospicium expenses total £4,345 2s.7 1/2d., ranging from the £19 7s.4d. on Good Friday 1369 to the £136 19s.5 1/2d. on St. George's Day. The account, covering 136 days, has an average daily expenditure of almost £31 19s. The household was stationed at Windsor for the duration of the period of account.

The total Hospicium expenditure for the 366 days (1372 was a leap year) of the first year of Wakefield's account is £13,876 2s.3 1/2d.; the daily average amounted to some £37 18s.3d. The daily total varies from a low of £17 5s.6d. on 31 January 1372 to a high of £184 11s.1d. on St. George's Day. During Wakefield's first year, the household resided at Henley from 28 June 1371 to 6 July; at Windsor from 7 July to 11 August; at Takeham on 12 August; at Marlborough from 13 August to 15 September; at Windsor from 16 September to 28 November; at Eltham from 29 November 1371 to 17 April 1372; and at Windsor from 18 April to 27 June.

A total of £13,747 11s.7d. was spent by the household in the second year of Wakefield's account, averaging some £37 13s.3 1/2d. per day. There is variation from a low of £21 18s.9d. on 7 December 1372 to a high of £236 14s.3 1/2d. on Christmas Day. In this second year, the household was at

Windsor from 28 June 1372 to 31 July; at Eltham from 1 to 11 August; at Gravesend on 12 and 13 August; at Leeds on 14, 15, and 16 August; at Godmersham on 17 August; at Preston from 18 to 26 August; on shipboard from 27 August to 14 October;[7] at Sheen from 15 October to 7 November; at Windsor from 8 November to 4 December; at Sheen from 5 to 11 December; at Eltham from 12 December 1372 to 29 January 1373; at Sheen from 30 January to 26 March; at Langley from 27 March to 20 April, and at Windsor from 21 April to 27 June, the end of the accounting period.

Beverley's account covers 244 days, at a daily average of some £37 1s.6 1/2d., for a total Hospicium expense of £9,046 18s.4 1/2d.[8] The lowest amount is £9 14s.4 1/2d. on 15 July 1377, the highest £566 5s.5d. on 5 July, the day of Edward's funeral. Both of these sums are found after Edward's death, which took place on 21 June. The lowest and highest expenses in this account while Edward was alive are the £18 2s.4d. on 19 June and the £293 20d. on the feast of St. George. The household was stationed at Windsor from 25 November 1376 to 27 June 1377; at Sheen from 28 June to 2 July; at St. Paul's on 3 July; at Westminster from 4 to 8 July; and at Bernelines from 9 to 26 July, the last day of the account.

A comparison of the daily average Hospicium expenditures (see Table I) reveals that Farley's expenses are far lower than those in the other accounts. The reasons for this are

TABLE I

HOSPICIUM EXPENSES

	Daily Average	Total
Farley	£24 17s.4d.	£8,554 6s. 1/2d.
Gunthorpe	£48 1s.4 1/2d.	£17,545 4s.10d.
Ypres	£31 19s.	£4,354 2s.7 1/2d.
Wakefield (year 1)	£37 18s.3d.	£13,876 2s.3 1/2d.
Wakefield (year 2)	£37 13s.3 1/2d.	£13,747 11s.7d.
Beverley	£37 1s.6 1/2d.	£9,046 18s.4 1/2d.

discussed below.[9] The daily averages in Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts are very similar in value; Gunthorpe averages some £10 higher. This higher sum arises from the fact that Philippa's household had been attached to that of the king.[10] The daily expense in the queen's establishment seems to have been £10, a figure based on the sum paid each day by her receiver into the king's household. Philippa's household was officially attached to that of the king from September 1362 to September 1368, but actually continued in a subordinate position right up to the time of her death on 15 August 1369. Ypres' account is within this period, and records payments made by the queen's receiver into the king's wardrobe,[11] as well as the fees, robes, and footwear allowances made to her servants.[12] However, the level of daily expenses in Ypres' account is far below that of Gunthorpe's. The reason for this is twofold: first, both Edward and Philippa were ill at this time;[13] secondly, with the return of the Black Death in the spring of 1369, the king and queen closeted themselves in Windsor, probably with as few personal attendants as possible.[14] Certainly, the expenses of some £70 on Easter Sunday and some £137 on St. George's Day are by far the lowest amounts for these feasts in all the accounts, save Farley's. It would appear from the surviving accounts, therefore, that the average Hospicium expense during the last 15 years of Edward III's reign was some £37 or £38.

As has been noted, the Hospicium expenses do not always reflect strictly domestic expenses. Farley's and Wakefield's accounts include household expenses incurred while Edward was on a military campaign, while Beverley's includes those of the king's funeral. These non-domestic expenses are of some interest.

The period of Farley's account covers Edward's Rheims campaign in France during 1359-60, as well as the subsequent peace negotations.[15] However, the sums seem to be only Farley's actual expenditures, not the true costs of the household; in addition, the account includes a period when the keeper was not responsible for household expenses incurred by the king.

Farley's accounting period commences on 3 November 1359, the day before Edward set out from Calais on his expedition. The king's military activities continued until 27 April 1360. Between 1 and 8 May 1360 peace negotiations were held at Brétigny. Delegates signed a treaty on the latter date; the kings of England and France were to ratify it at some future date in Calais. With the treaty concluded, Edward and his army headed for Le Neubourg. From there the army under the leadership of Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, made its way to Calais, and reached England toward the end of May. Edward, his sons, and some personal advisors, left Le Neubourg, and journeyed to Honfleur via Thibouville. The king embarked at Honfleur on 18 May, landing at Rye on the same day. While Edward hurried to England, the household stayed temporarily in France, then made its way slowly back to England from Calais.

The wardrobe staff, however, remained in Calais.[16] Edward found this so awkward that on 26 May 1360 he established a new household, under the keepership of William de Ferriby, to be responsible for expenses in England.[17] Farley remained in charge of expenditures in Calais. The gap in Farley's Hospicium expenses from 3 to 29 June seems to correspond with the period when Farley and the wardrobe briefly returned to England.[18] Hospicium expenses recommence on 30 June with Farley in France preparing for the arrivals of the kings of France and England to ratify the Treaty of Brétigny. Edward landed on 9 October and the treaty was ratified on 24 October. The king returned to England in early November and Farley on 7 November, the final day of the account.

Farley's Hospicium expenses begin on 3 November 1359 with some £58; the daily expense gradually declines to some £14 by the end of March 1360, although on Christmas Day £47 18s.9 3/4d is spent. After the £31 18s.3d. on Easter Sunday (5 April 1360) expenses again increase from a low of about £13 to about £30 by the third week of May, excluding about £47 and £80 on 12 and 13 May respectively. There is a rapid increase after 23 May, and over £135 is reached on 2 June.

Of the expenses recorded between 3 November 1359 and 2 June 1360, it is only those between 10 May, when Edward and his familia[19] left the army, and 26 May, when a second household was established, which seem to reflect true household costs. During the period of the campaign, the sums in the account probably do not represent actual costs because supplies seized from the French and those brought from England, for which Farley would not have to pay, would not have been recorded as expenses when consumed.

Sums after 30 June refer only to expenditures incurred in Calais. Between 30 June and the end of August, the expenses are in the £10 to £15 range, although over £26 was spent on 11 July, presumably reflecting the presence of members of the king's familia who guarded king John of France when he was brought to Calais on 10 July.[20] From 31 August to 7 October expenses were in the £25 to £30 range, although almost £77 was spent on 5 September. The steward, treasurer, and others arrived in Calais on 12 September.[21] Edward reached Calais on 9 October, an event reflected by the higher sums recorded from 8 October. Between 8 and 12 October the expenses rose from about £34 to some £52. On 13 October,[22] £217 17s.3 1/4d. was spent, and nearly £77 on the following day. Thereafter, expenses fluctuate greatly from day to day, between some £90 on 18 October and some £33 on 6 November; the average is about £50 per day. The Treaty of Brétigny was ratified on 24 October; Edward and John are said to have held a feast on that day,[23] although the day's expenses amount to only £42 16s. 6d. However, a celebration was certainly held on 13 October, as is verified by the approximately £218 spent.

The second account to record other than domestic expenditures is the second year of Wakefield's. Edward attempted to cross the Channel to relieve the siege of La Rochelle, but was prevented from doing so by contrary winds. While on shipboard with his household between 27 August and 14 October 1372, he was joined by soldiers and nobles, including his ailing son, the Black Prince. In the three weeks preceding the attempted sea voyage, daily expenses rose from the £25 to £30 range to the £50 to £60 range, where they remained until 4 October; by 14 Octobar they decreased to £30. These increased expenses had no appreciable effect upon the yearly total.[24]

The final account to contain other than routine domestic expenses is Beverley's. This records the expenses of Edward's funeral. In the first three weeks of June 1377, the daily expenditure fell within the £20 to £30 range. On Sunday, 21 June, the day Edward died, an expense of £32 7s.11 1/2d. is recorded. However, £46 14s.3d. was spent on the following day, presumably because of the presence of individuals who had come to pay their final respects. The Hospicium expenses normally remain in the £25 to £35 range from 23 June to 2 July. There is a dramatic increase for Edward's funeral; the expenditure was £79 2s.4d. on Friday 3 July, £145 17s.4 1/2d. on 4 July, £566 5s.5d. on Sunday, 5 July (the day of the king's funeral), and £51 7s.10 1/2d. on 6 July.[25] From 7 to 26 July, the last day of the account, the expenses ranged from £10 to £15 as a reduced household settled Edward's affairs.

The daily household expenditure[26] is recorded in eleven different categories in the following order: pantry, buttery, wardrobe, kitchen, poultry, scullery, saucery, hall and chamber, stable, wages, and alms.[27] Apart from the stable, wages, and alms, all are household departments or subdepartments although the list named here is not comprehensive. The expenses of unnamed departments are, perhaps, included under one or other of the above headings.

The daily "departmental" expenses in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley are similar. Firstly, expenses are recorded under each heading every day. Secondly, on ordinary, that is non-feast days, the expenses of each department are generally responsible for a similar proportion of the total daily expenditure. Possibly because of the household's involvement in the war effort and the peace negotiations, Farley's expenses do not resemble those in the other accounts. The difference between Farley's and the other accounts can be seen in Table II. In Farley's account, no expenses are recorded under some headings. Hall expenses occur only 15 times, all but one after the break in the Hospicium expenses. None of these are recorded on consecutive days. No wages are recorded prior to the break, presumably because the household was on a war time footing, and all the members of the household were receiving war wages. Stable expenses are recorded only for the period prior to the break and for the first week afterwards. For lengthy periods before the break, expenses of the scullery and saucery are not recorded; for long periods before and after the break, chamber

TABLE II

THE PERCENTAGE DIVISION OF THE DAILY HOSPICIUM EXPENDITURE

	Farley*	Other Accounts**
Pantry	1 - 5%	3 - 7%
Buttery	10 - 30	15 - 25
Wardrobe	5 - 25	5 - 15
Kitchen	10 - 40	20 - 30
Poultry	---	2 - 10
Scullery	2 - 4	1
Saucery	1	1
Hall and Chamber	1	1 - 5
Stable	15 - 55	5 - 15
Wages	5 - 50	5 - 10
Alms	1	1

[*] Farley's account does not record any poultry expenses, while those of the hall and chamber are listed separately. However, for long periods no chamber expenses appear and those of the hall rarely occur. Prior to 4 June 1360 no wages are listed and expenses of the scullery and saucery do not occur for long periods. Stable expenses are recorded only until the first week in July.

[**] These are the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley.

expenses do not occur.

The pantry was that department which purchased or purveyed bread; the bakery, a subdepartment, bought or purveyed the necessary flour and grain, and baked bread. All bread was stored in the pantry, and issued as required before each meal. The waferer was a member of the pantry. Generally, the pantry accounts for some 3% to 7% of the daily Hospicium expense in Gunthorpe's, Ypres', Wakefield's, and Beverley's wardrobe books, but only some 1% to 5% in Farley's.

The buttery provided the wine and ale required by the household and served these beverages at meals. The department had custody of the pots and cups, tankards, barrels, and other assorted vessels necessary to carry out its tasks. The buttery accounts for some 10% to 30% of the daily expense in Farley's account, but some 15% to 25% in the other four.

The wardrobe was responsible for drawing up the accounts of the household, as well as being charged with the safe custody of plate (although in practice most was in the custody of various department heads) and the king's clothing. Clothing was apparently kept in a subdepartment called the wardrobe of robes.[28] The wardrobe incurred expenses for coffers, pens, ink, parchment, sealing wax, and so forth. There was a very close relationship between the wardrobe and the spicery. The spicery stored and distributed wax, napery, linen, cloth, canvas, and spices (including spices proper, but also such things as almonds, raisins, figs, and sugar). The chandlery, which made and distributed candles, and the office of the fruiterer, who purveyed fruit, were subdepartments of the spicery. The wardrobe expenses may perhaps include those daily spicery expenses which were not chargeable to other departments.[29] The wardrobe had the facilities for storing clothing, as well as valuable non-perishable commodities which were not bulky, precisely the facilities required by the spicery. In addition, the clerk of the spicery was also the chief usher of the wardrobe. Finally, the Household Ordinances of 1318 reveal that, to make wafers, the waferer received eggs from the poultry and sugurr de la garderobe.[30] In Farley's account, the wardrobe's expenses normally amount to some 5% to 25% of the daily total, but to only some 5% to 15% in the other accounts.

The kitchen purchased or purveyed the meats and fish consumed by the household, and, of course, cooked all the meals. Meat and fish were stored in the larder, a subdepartment of the kitchen. The kitchen expenses varied from 10% to 40% of the daily total in Farley's account, and between 20% and 30% in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley. In the latter accounts, the daily kitchen expense is generally the highest among the several "departmental" expenses.

The poultry, a subdepartment of the kitchen, purchased or purveyed and also stored the eggs and poultry needed by the household. It may also have stored the wild fowl taken by the king's falconers. Poultry and fowl were scalded by a sergeant "garbager" before they were delivered to the kitchen.[31] No poultry expenses appear in Farley's account. The other accounts reveal by the very low poultry expenses that Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday were fish days; expenditures on these days are always much lower than those on the other days of the week.[32] This holds true whether a feast day or not, except for Christmas Day and St. George's Day. Generally, the lowest poultry expenditure is on Friday and the highest on Sunday, differing by some £3 or £4. On fish days, the poultry expense amounts to some 2% of the daily total; on other days, to some 10%. During Lent the poultry expenses are very low, some 1% to 2% of the Hospicium expense.

The scullery, another subdepartment of the kitchen, purchased or purveyed, as well as stored, the wood and coal and the pots and pans, both wooden and metal, used in the kitchen. Silver vessels used by the kitchen were also in the custody of the scullery. In Farley's account, scullery expenses amount to some 2% to 4% of the daily total, but to only 1% or less in the four other accounts.

The saucery, also a subdepartment of the kitchen, purchased or purveyed flour and other materials necessary for the preparation of the sauces. In all five accounts the expenses amounted to 1% or less of the daily total.

The hall and chamber were the two departments responsible for the lodging of the king and the household, as well as for ensuring the proper seating at, and the proper serving of, the meals. The chamber served the king and his entourage, the hall the other household personnel. The sums recorded in the titulus result from the purchase of litter for sleeping and fuel for heating. The accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley combine the expenses of the two departments, but Farley's records them separately. In the four former accounts the expenses vary from 1% to 5% of the total daily expenditure, and, since expenses were higher in winter than in summer, the percentages represent summer and winter expenditures respectively. Farley's account rarely enters any expenses for the chamber; those for the hall are 1% or less.

The heading "stable" records the expenses of caring for the horses attached to the household, the primary duty of the office of the marshalsea and its subordinate offices. The expenses include the costs of oats, hay, litter, medicines, harnesses, and other things relating to horses, as well as the costs of repairing, and purchasing equipment for, the carts. In Farley's account, the stable expenses vary from 15% to 55%, but in the others they vary only between 15% and 25%.

The second duty of the marshalsea was to keep a record of the daily presence in, or absence from, court of household personnel. This list was used not only as a check on the total daily household expenditure, but also as the basis for the payment of wages to those household servants present at court, with the exception of hunters and falconers, whose wages are recorded in separate tituli.[33] The Hospicium expenses give the total daily wages, although household servants received their wages in lump sums only periodically. In Farley's account, wages amount to 5% to 50% of the total daily expenditure, but to only 5% to 10% in the other accounts.

The final division of the Hospicium expenses is the "alms", which records the daily fixed alms granted by the king. Presumably, such alms took the form of food and drink, perhaps the leftovers of the meal served in the household.[34] However, it is possible that these alms were gifts of money. Wakefield's account reveals that Edward had a silver jar in which were kept his alms.[35] If meals were issued, then the cost must have been estimated, since the daily alms are constant throughout the periods of account; they are 2s. in Gunthorpe's, 4s. in Farley's, Wakefield's, and Beverley's, and 6s. in Ypres'. In all the accounts they represent 1% or less of the daily expense.

The Hospicium titulus, therefore, contains the daily expenditures of feeding and housing the court. During that part of the final 15 years of Edward's reign covered by the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley, the daily average would appear to be about £37 or £38. Actually, Gunthorpe's account has a daily expense of £48, but the extra £10, as has been noted, is due to the cost of Philippa's household, attached to that of her husband's. The average expense in Ypres' account is only some £32, but this low value is caused by the illness of both Edward and Philippa during the accounting period, and by the fact that the Black Death had returned to England; the king and queen retired to Windsor with as few staff as possible. Farley's daily average is only £25, but his account does not reflect actual costs, because of the military campaign and because two households existed during part of Farley's period of account.

The daily expenditures were divided into certain departments or categories, depending upon how the expense was incurred. The most important departmental expenses in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley were those of the buttery, kitchen, and stable; together they accounted for about one-half to three-quarters of the daily expense. The remainder was usually accounted for by the wages, wardrobe, pantry, and poultry, since the combined expenses of the scullery, saucery, hall and chamber, and alms only amounted to some 5% of the daily expenditure. Although the expenses in Farley's account differ, they do not represent normal domestic expenditures.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1] The title Hospicium is used to describe these expenses (eg., Tout, Chapters, VI, p. 73) in order to distinguish them from the household's foreign expenses (see pp. 8-9).

[2] However, the value of gifts of food and wine, and meat provided by hunters and falconers, when consumed, are not listed among these expenses because they cost the household nothing.

[3] An example of the daily expenses is given in n. 25 below.

[4] Possibly the exchequer did not require details of these routine expenses because it regarded the internal household accounting procedures as satisfactory. Thus, a record was kept of the number of persons residing at court and the number of messes served at meals as a means of verifying the expense claimed in the domestic offices (see pp. 282, 293). In addition, such expenses had already been audited by the dual heads of the household, the steward and treasurer (see pp. 298-99).

[5] Farley's account has a gap from 3 to 29 June 1360 inclusive when no expenses are listed (see below, p. 77).

[6] See the tables in Appendix II.

[7] See below, pp. 78-79.

[8] Beverley's account also indicates that the household consumed 1 cask 140 gallons of verjuice without value from the 5 casks received from Adam de Hertyngdon, clerk of the works at Windsor Castle (see pp. 48, 56). The Prestita states that the remaining 3 casks 140 gallons of verjuice were delivered to William de Pakington, the first keeper of Richard II's wardrobe. Beverley's is the only account to specify the expenditure of any stores among the Hospicium expenses. No explanation is given but perhaps the verjuice was employed during the embalming of Edward's body (see Ralph E. Giesey, The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Rennaissance France (Gèneve, Librairie E. Droz, 1960), p. 27).

[9] See pp. 78-79.

[10] See Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 170-75, especially p. 175, and above, p. 50.

[11] See p. 50.

[12] See pp. 171-72.

[13] Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 182.

[14] Frederick G. Kay, The Lady of the Sun - The Life and Times of Alice Perrers (London, Frederick Muller, 1966), pp. 67-68.

[15] For Edward's activities during this period, see Kenneth Fowler, The King's Lieutenant - Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster, 1310-1361 (New York, Barnes and Noble, 1969), pp. 197-213.

[16] See Tout, Chapters III, pp. 227-28, and IV, pp. 145-50.

[17] Ibid., IV, p. 150 n. 4.

[18] Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 146.

[19] The familia includes not only members of the king's family, but also the inner group of confidants, household officers, and servants who accompanied the king whenever he was absent from the household. However, in the present instance, the chief household officers remained in France.

[20] See below, p. 130, and Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 145 n. 1. However, Fowler, King's Lieutenant, p. 212, and John Le Patourel, "The Treaty of Brétigny, 1360", Transactions of The Royal Historical Society, 5th ser., vol. X (1960), p. 35, say 8 July.

[21] See below, pp. 130-31, and Tout, Chapters, IV, p. 145 n. 1.

[22] The sizeable amount found on 13 October corresponds to the feast of the Translation of Edward the Confessor,

although, in fact, no reason is given. However, this particular feast is mentioned in the Elemosina as one of the holy days on which Edward granted special alms (see p. 119 n.19). Occasionally, the accounts identify feasts by a marginal notation next to the day in question, but no such remarks appear in Farley's account; generally, only feasts such as Easter, St. George's Day, and Christmas are noted in the other accounts. In general, all the accounts, save Farley's, show increased expenditures on the feasts of the Circumcision , the Epiphany (6 January), the Purification of the Blessed Mary or Candlemas (2 February), Easter Sunday, St. George's Day (23 April), Pentecost, All Saints Day (1 November), and Christmas Day.

[23] Fowler, King's Lieutenant, p. 213.

[24] See Table I, p. 74.

[25] The daily expenses for the period 1 to 7 July (folios 23v, 24r) are as follows:

On Wednesday, 1 July, at Sheen: pantry, 17s.2 1/2d.; buttery, 101s.9d.; wardrobe, 49s.6d.; kitchen, £6 16s.2d.; poultry, 18s.8d.; scullery, 3s.8d.; saucery, 3s.11 1/2d.; hall and chamber, 6s.7d.; stable, 68s.11 1/2d.; wages, 36s.8d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £22 7s.1 1/2d.

On Thursday, 2 July, at Sheen: pantry, 12s.10d.; buttery, £7 4s.; wardrobe, 30s.9 1/2d.; kitchen, £9 2s.1 1/2d.; poultry, 40s.6d.; scullery, 3s.8d.; saucery, 4s.2d.; hall and chamber, 5s.11d.; stable, 68s.11 1/2d.; wages, 61s.5d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £27 18s.4 1/2d.

On Friday, 3 July, at St. Paul's; pantry, £4 14s.4d.; buttery, £23 11s.3 1/2d.; wardrobe, £20 12s. 7 1/2d.; kitchen, £19 11s. 3 1/2d.; poultry, 19s.; scullery, 20 1/2d.; saucery, 7s. 1/2d.; hall and chamber, 8s.3d.; stable, 109s.10 1/2d.; wages, 63s.11d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £79 2s.4d.

On Saturday, 4 July at Westminster: pantry, £10 11s. 1/2d.; buttery, £46 12s.7 1/2d.; wardrobe, £32 17s.10 1/2d.; kitchen, £35 18s.7d.; poultry, 14s.7 1/2d.; scullery, £6 2s.2d.; saucery, 9s.11d.; hall and chamber, 77s.5d.; stable, 108s.11 1/2d.; wages, 60s.2d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £145 17s.4 1/2d.

On Sunday, 5 July, at Westminster: pantry, £15 13s.9 1/2d.; buttery, £132 4s.5 1/2d.; wardrobe, £115 17s.9 1/2d.; kitchen, £99 18s.6 1/2d.; poultry, £129 16d.; scullery, £44 13s.10d.; saucery, £4 7s.7d.; hall and chamber, £12 4s.11d.; stable, £8 19s.; wages, 60s.2d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £566 5s.5d.

On Monday, 6 July, at Westminster: pantry, £6 14s.9d.; buttery, £12 13s.3 1/2d.; wardrobe, £11 7s.9d.; kitchen, £10 9s.4 1/2d.; poultry, 38s.11 1/2d.; scullery, 4s.6d.; saucery, 4s.1d.; hall and chamber, 7s.; stable, £6 4s.3d.; wages, 19s.11d.; alsm, 4s. Sums, £51 7s.10 1/2d.

On Tuesday, 7 July, at Westminister: pantry, 8s.11d.; buttery, 24s.1 1/2d.; wardrobe, 10s.6d.; kitchen, 50s.11 1/2d.; poultry, 16s.7 1/2d.; scullery, 10d.; saucery, 2s.3 1/2d.; hall and chamber, 2s.3d.; stable, 71s.11 1/2d.; wages, 19s.6d.; alms, 4s. Sum, £10 11s.11 1/2d.

[26] In about half the weeks covered, the accounts (save Farley's) indicate that the total daily expenditure on Friday was the weekly low while that on Sunday was the weekly high.

[27] Except Farley's account, which has no poultry, the hall and chamber being recorded separately.

[28] See pp. 134, 294.

[29] To my knowledge, this suggestion has not been made before.

[30] Tout, "Household Ordinances", Edward II, p. 286.

[31] Ibid., p. 295, and Frederick J. Furnivall, ed., King Edward II's Household and Wardrobe Ordinances, A.D. 1323 in Life-Records of Chaucer, 2nd ser., vol. 14 (London, Chaucer Society, 1876), p. 36.

[32] For these days being fish days, see Labarge, Baronial Household, p. 78. Although not a period of routine domestic expenditures, this can be seen from the daily expenses recorded in n. 25 above.

[33] See Chapter XII.

[34] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 218.

[35] See. p. 137.

CHAPTER V

ELEMOSINA

The titulus Elemosina (Alms) records the value of grants of oblations and alms.[1] Oblations were solemn offerings at religious services or holy places. A set oblation is recorded for daily masses; on special feast days sums greater than the daily set oblation were offered. Occasionally, oblations were also granted to the celebrants of the mass. Offerings of this nature were made by Edward, Philippa, and others.

Alms were gifts of charity. Those recorded in the Elemosina were of a special nature, being described as issued "from the king's special alms" or granted "by the king's special grace". Such alms were granted at specific times or to specific individuals for specific reasons; they are distinct from the ordinary, daily set alms, recorded in the Hospicium expenses, which were distributed to paupers who chanced to be at hand. Special alms include payments granted on certain feast days, gifts of charity or food allowances to paupers, and grants of wine to religious houses for the celebration of the mass. Generally, alms were offered only by Edward.

The accounts record set oblations first. All the accounts state that Edward offered a "large coin" (magnus denarius) valued at 7d.[2] at daily masses celebrated in his presence. Several accounts reveal that queen Philippa and two minors, Edward's son Thomas[3] and Joan, the lady of Brittany (domicella Britann'),[4] also granted daily set oblations at masses. Gunthorpe and Ypres state that Philippa offered a "large coin" valued at 5d. Thomas offered 1d. daily in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield, while Joan offered 1d. in Gunthorpe's account.

Normally, the period during which daily oblations were offered corresponds to the period of account, but this is not true for Farley and Beverley. Farley's account should cover the period 3 November 1359 to 7 November 1360, but the daily oblations actually extend from 3 November 1359 to 31 Janaury 1361. Beverley's account extends from 25 November 1376 to 26 July 1377, but daily oblations cease on 5 July, the day of Edward's funeral.

Following the entries which give the details of the daily oblations are recorded, chronologically, oblations made on feast days by Edward, Philippa, Thomas, the lady of Brittany, and others, such as minors or wards who appear to have been in court on a particular feast day.

English custom dictated that every adult should offer oblations on four feasts a year.[5] For Edward these four feasts would appear to have been the Epiphany, Candlemas, Good Friday, and St. John the Evangelist. The accounts of Gunthorpe, Wakefield, and Beverley state that on these days the king offered oblations of "gold" which were greater than the daily set oblation. Ypres' short account mentions only Good Friday, but does reveal that such oblations were distributed by John de Saxton, Edward's chief chaplain. The greater oblations in all four accounts were identical, but in Gunthorpe's the greater oblation was in addition to the daily set oblation; in the other three they replaced them.[6] These four particular feasts also occur in Farley's account, but they are not shown to have been special and the oblations are not identical to those in the other accounts. In addition to these four feasts, the accounts reveal that Edward granted oblations additional to his daily set ones on Easter Sunday and St. George's Day.

As did her husband, Philippa granted oblations greater than her daily set one on certain feasts. Gunthorpe names these as the Epiphany, Candlemas, Good Friday, Easter Sunday, and Christmas Day. In this account, Philippa's greater oblations were additional to her daily oblations. Of these special feasts, only Good Friday appears in Ypres' short account; the greater oblation replaced the daily one.

The king's son Thomas granted greater oblations on certain feast days in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield. In the latter two, these greater oblations replaced the daily set oblation, but in Gunthorpe's they supplemented them. The feasts on which these oblations were granted are not identical in all the accounts. The most complete list comes from the second year of Wakefield's, which states that Thomas granted greater oblations on Candlemas, Good Friday, Easter, Pentecost, All Saints, and Christmas. This list includes all the feasts found in the first year and in Ypres' account. Gunthorpe names only some of these feasts but adds the Epiphany and Corpus Christi. Oblations on special feast days were made by the lady of Brittany and others, but occur only on those days that Thomas made offerings. Oblations made by Thomas and others were made in the presence of the king or queen.

Oblations on feast days cover the entire periods of account in all but Farley's. Despite the lengthy period of Farley's daily set oblations, those made on feast days extend only from Christmas Day 1359 to Easter Sunday (5 April) 1360. Special oblations after this time were possibly the responsibility of William de Ferriby. In the following discussion of the chronologically entered oblations on feast days, emphasis will be placed on those made by the king.

In all but Ypres' account, which does not include the feast, Edward's oblation on the Lord's Epiphany is one gold noble valued at 6s.8d. Gunthorpe, Wakefield, and Beverley refer to additional gifts of myrrh and frankincense. Edward celebrated Epiphany at Verzey, near Rheims, in Farley's account, at the manor of Sheen in Gunthorpe's and both years of Wakefield's, and at Havering in Beverley's. Gunthorpe records Philippa's oblation for this feast as one crown (scutum), valued at 3s.4d., along with myrrh and frankincense, granted at Windsor Castle.

On the feast of Candlemas, Gunthorpe, Wakefield, and Beverley state that Edward's oblation was five gold nobles infixed in his candle (in precio quinque nobilium auri cereo suo infixorum). Farley's account mentions a greater oblation of three gold nobles, but does not specify their being infixed in a candle. Edward celebrated Candlemas at Trowanseingeorge in France in Farley's account, at Moorend in Gunthorpe's, at the manor of Eltham in the first year of Wakefield's and at Sheen in the second, and at Havering in Beverley's. On this feast day, Gunthorpe shows that Philippa offered 5 gold crowns, each valued at 3s.4d.; lord Thomas and the countess of March[7] both offered 5 groats, each worth 4d., and the lady of Brittany offered 5 half groats. The offerings of all four, made at Windsor Castle, were infixed in candles. Finally, Thomas and the earls of Pembroke[8] and March[9] in the first year of Wakefield's account, and Thomas and the earl and countess of Cambridge[10] in the second year, offered 5 silver groats infixed in their separate candles.

The accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley show that Edward made the adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, and offered in oblations three gold nobles and 5s. in silver pennies, for a total of 25s. On this feast in Farley's account Edward made two separate offerings, the first of 5s. in silver pennies and the second of two gold nobles, at the Lord's Cross. These coins were then redeemed in money of equivalent value, and gold and silver cramp rings made from them. Later, these rings were hallowed by the king; such royal cramp rings were regarded as a cure for epilepsy.[11] Good Friday was observed by Edward at Chanteloup in Farley's account, at Windsor Castle in Gunthorpe's and Ypres', at the manor of Eltham in Wakefield's first year and in the church of the Dominican brothers of Langley in the second year, and at Sheen in Beverley's.

In the accounts of Gunthorpe and Ypres, Philippa adored the Cross on Good Friday in the same place as her husband and offered 5s. in silver pennies. These oblations were then redeemed, and cramp rings made from them.[12] Ypres indicates that lord Thomas, the countess of March, and the lady of Brittany adored the Cross on Good Friday and together offered 12d. in oblations. The earl of Cambridge in the first year and Thomas in both years of Wakefield's account offered 3 groats at these services.

The accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley reveal that Edward offered one gold noble at the adoration of the Cross of the Resurrection on Easter Sunday. The oblations of this feast day in Farley's account differ. Edward offered 5s. in silver pennies at the Lord's Cross on the dawn of Easter Sunday and a gold noble at a high mass celebrated later on the same day. Gunthorpe and Ypres show that Philippa adored the Cross and offered 5s. in silver pennies. Others making oblations on this day in the various accounts are Thomas, the earls of Pembroke and Cambridge, the earl and countess of March, and the lady of Brittany.

Oblations for St. George's Day do not occur in Farley's account, presumably because the king celebrated that festival only in St. George's Chapel at Windsor Castle. St. George's Day was the occasion for the annual feast of the Order of the Garter. Only Edward is recorded as offering an oblation in the accounts, with the exception of Beverley's. In that account, the heir to the throne, Richard of Bordeaux, also offered an oblation of 6s.8d., no doubt because he was then invested into the order. Edward offered 6s.8d., usually stated to be in the form of a gold noble, at a high mass celebrated on St. George's Day. He also gave oblations to celebrants, ranging from 5d. in Gunthorpe's account to 8s.10d. in the second year of Wakefield's. After mass Edward adored the Cross of Neyt[13] in Windsor Castle, and offered an additional 6s.8d. The accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley show Edward attending a Requiem Mass in St. George's Chapel on the morrow of St. George's Day. The familiar 6s.8d. was offered.

Farley's account records that on Christmas Day Edward offered one gold noble in oblations at Verzy in France. In the second year of Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts Edward granted oblations to the celebrants. Gunthorpe states that Philippa offered one gold crown at Windsor Castle. Oblations on this day made by Thomas, the countess of March, or the lady of Brittany are also recorded in several accounts.

The last feast day of the year on which oblations were offered is that of St. John the Evangelist. Gunthorpe, Wakefield, and Beverley say that Edward offered a gold franc valued at 3s.4d. On this festival in Farley's account Edward's oblation is one gold mouton valued at 4s. Edward is the only person recorded as offering oblations on this particular feast day, which was celebrated at Verzey in Farley's account, at Windsor Castle in Gunthorpe's, at Eltham in both years of Wakefield's, and at Havering in Beverley's.

The accounts record some miscellaneous oblations. For example, at some time between Candlemas and Maundy Thursday in Farley's account, Edward offered £16 13s.4d. in _Crealx_ of gold, each valued at 3s.4d., at the shrine of St. Edmund in Pontigny in France.

Gunthorpe's account records that on the day of St. Nicholas (6 December 1366) the lady of Brittany offered 3s.4d. in oblations at Windsor to a certain boy in the diocese who, as was the custom, was elected to be bishop for the day. Edward offered 3s.4d. to the boy-bishop at Gravesend, but this money came from his alms, not his oblations.

Two accounts record oblations at anniversary masses. The first year of Wakefield's account shows that on 24 August 1371, the anniversary of the funeral of queen Philippa, Thomas attended a Requiem Mass celebrated in the king's chapel in Marlborough Castle in the presence of Joan of Kent (_domina Principissa_), wife of Edward the Black Prince. Thomas' oblations amounted to 8d. Beverley shows that Edward attended an anniversary mass for his son Edward on 8 June 1377 at the manor of Sheen. The celebrants received 11d.

Included among the dated oblations are entries in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield which state that Edward made offerings at shrines in Canterbury. Gunthorpe's account says that on 12 April 1366 Edward offered 106s.8d. at the shrine of St. Thomas the Martyr in Christ Church Cathedral. At holy places in Canterbury, the king offered 100s. on 14 May 1369 in Ypres' account, 113s.4d. on 1 April 1372 in Wakefield's first year, and 166s.8d. on 18 August 1372 in Wakefield's second year.

Ypres and Wakefield show that Edward's oblations in Canterbury follow a fairly definite routine. In Christ Church Edward gave oblations at the shrine of St. Thomas, at the head of St. Thomas, at the image of the Blessed Mary in the vault, at the old tomb of St. Thomas, and "at the point of the sword" (_ad punctum gladii_ - the altar built marking the place where St. Thomas was murdered). In the Church of St. Augustine Edward made regular oblations at the shrine of St. Augustine and at the head of St. Augustine, in addition to various other shrines. Edward offered money at the shrines of St. Mildred and St. Adrian in Ypres' account; at the shrine of St. Adrian in the first year of Wakefield's account; and at the altars of St. Gundred and St. Wenfrid and at the "place" (_locum_) of St. Gilbert in the second year. The oblations at the shrine of St. Thomas, the image of the Blessed Mary, and the shrine of St. Augustine were 20s. in Ypres' account,[14] 26s.8d. in Wakefield's first year, and 40s. in Wakefield's second year. Oblations of 6s.8d. were offered at all the other holy places. In the second year of Wakefield's account, Thomas offered a total of 7s. in the same places as his father.

In the second year of Wakefield's account, the timing (18 August) and the oblations made at the "place" of St. Gilbert, where Edward asked for a fair wind (ad postulandum ventum), suggest a connection between the oblations and Edward's unsuccessful attempt to cross the Channel to relieve La Rochelle. Edward was on shipboard from 27 August to 14 October, but his prayers went unanswered. If the higher oblations in Wakefield's second year do reflect specific prayers for the successful conclusion of this voyage, then the total oblations at the shrines in Canterbury in all three accounts are fairly constant.

With a few exceptions, alms follow the oblations in the Elemosina. Appearing among the dated oblations are the alms granted by Edward to the boy-bishop on the day of St. Nicholas, which are mentioned above,[15] the costs of a silver chalice charged to the queen's alms mentioned below, and alms offered on Maundy Thursday by Edward, Thomas, and others. Aside from the costs of the chalice and the Maundy Thursday alms, payments from only Edward's special alms appear in the accounts.

Gunthorpe's account shows that on 22 September 1366 William de Burton, goldsmith and citizen of London, received 21s.9d. in money and 8s.3d. in the value of an old silver chalice for a new silver chalice which was given to the chapel in the manor of Havering. This sum came from the queen's alms.

Only Farley's account records alms granted by Edward on Maundy Thursday. These are mentioned below.[16] The accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield show that Thomas and others offered money on Maundy Thursday by the hands of either the king's or the queen's almoner. In Gunthorpe's account, 13d. was granted to each of 13 paupers on the maundy (in mandato) of the earl of Cambridge. In Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts, 13d.,10d., and 8d. respectively were granted to each of 13 paupers on the maundies of Thomas, the countess of March, and the lady of Brittany. In the two years of Wakefield's account, 12d. was granted to each of 13 paupers on the maundy of Thomas.

Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley indicate that Robert de Whitbergh, the king's almoner, was to pay out yearly for Edward's special alms a total of £100 in equal portions on the feasts of Easter, Pentecost, Michaelmas, and Christmas, although Beverley replaced Michaelmas with All Saints. The entire sum was paid only in Wakefield's account. Beverley's accounting period does not include the feast of All Saints; only Easter and Pentecost are within Ypres'. No similar payments are found in Gunthorpe's account. Farley mentions that the almoner, Thomas de Keynes, received £100 per year "for the increase of Edward's newly granted secret alms" (pro incremento secrete elemosine Regis de novo concesse). Keynes in fact paid out £19 13s.9d., but there is no explanation of when or by what method this was done. Perhaps these "secret" alms are the same as the "special"alms in later accounts.

In addition to the "secret" alms, Farley's account indicates that the almoner received payment for the £9 8s. paid out by him for the king's "great" alms (pro magna elemosina) of 4d. per day for the 47 days from 8 November to 24 December 1360. These appear to be an extension of the daily alms listed in the Hospicium expenses.[17] This is the only occurrence of alms of this type among the Elemosina expenses.

Paupers receive alms in all but Gunthorpe's account. The form taken by these alms differs radically between Farley's and the other accounts. Farley describes them as food allowances on special feast days, although it is unclear whether these were actual meals or sums of money in lieu thereof. Alms to paupers in the other three accounts are daily payments of money.

Farley's list of feast days on which food allowances were issued is quite extensive. With one exception, all entries are grouped together. The exception shows that on Maundy Thursday at Chanteloup, near Poissey, 25 paupers received 3s.4d. each from Edward's special alms. The gift of 3s.4d. per pauper is the largest recorded in the account; next highest is 2d. In the grouped entries, one item states that 50 paupers each received a food allowance of 1d. on Maundy Thursday in 1360.

The fact that the exception is the only entry in Farley's account which gives the place where the food allowances were issued, as well as the large individual payments, suggest that the king made the payments personally. The other food allowances presumably were made in England by the almoner, Thomas de Keynes. He does not seem to have accompanied the king abroad; at least he is not recorded as receiving war wages.

Farley's Elemosina also contains gifts of cloth, which follow the food allowances. Among these is an item stating that 200 ells of cloth of Candlewickstreet (now Cannon Street), 50 pairs of shoes, 4 ells of linen cloth, and 2 short towels, at a total cost of £15 16s.6d., were used on Edward's maundy. The shoes and cloth suggests that Edward's maundy practices included the washing of feet.

Aside from those on Maundy Thursday, food allowances were valued at either 1 1/2d. or 2d. A food allowance of 2d. was granted to each of 200 paupers on Christmas Eve in 1359 and 1360, and on Good Friday and on the eve of Easter Sunday in 1360. On Christmas Day in 1359 and on the feasts of Easter Sunday, Pentecost, All Saints, and All Souls in 1360, 200 poor each received a food allowance of 1 1/2d. One entry indicated that on the eves of 15 feasts[18] 50 paupers each received a food allowance of 1 1/2d. Another entry shows that 100 paupers each received a food allowance of 1 1/2d. on 42 feast days.[19] Finally, 50 paupers received a food allowance of 1 1/2d/ on each of the 15 Ember Days within the period that daily oblations were recorded in Farley's account; 100 paupers were granted a similar food allowance on the 59 Fridays during the same period.

The food allowances granted on two feasts special to the king are recorded separately. In 1359 and 1360, 300 paupers each received 1 1/2d. on the feast of St. Brice (13 November), Edward's birthday (quo die Rex nascebatur). A food allowance of 1d. was granted to each of 1,000 paupers in 1360 on the feast day of St. Matthew (21 September), the anniversary of the death of Edward's father (anniversarium Regis patris defuncti).

Farley's account alone records food allowances granted to large numbers of unspecified paupers on special feast days. Such grants appear to have ceased between Farley's keepership and that of Gunthorpe. Gunthorpe's account records no grants to paupers. Between his account and that of Ypres, new forms of alms to paupers appear.

In the accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley, alms to paupers take the form of 3d. to each recipient. These were distributed in two ways. On the king's oral command, Robert de Whitbergh paid out this sum every day to each of 14 unnamed paupers for their sustenance. Presumably recipients were those who chanced to be at hand. In addition, the almoner made daily grants, by the king's special grace, of 3d. per day to certain named men.

In Ypres' account only four paupers are named, but only by their surnames, a rare occurrence in the accounts. Thus, Marche, Warrewyk, Cokkere, and Wodestok received alms for the entire accounting period. By the first year of Wakefield's account, this method seems to have become fully established since the number of men (some 10 or 11) receiving alms remained relatively stable in the two years of Wakefield's and in Beverley's accounts. In the first year of Wakefield's account seven men (John Cokker, Roger Kyngesgrome, Thomas de Ilford, Thomas de Shirwod, Roger de Killesby, Jacob Boteman, and William de Bannebury) received alms for the entire accounting period; five men received them for only a part. One of these five, Robert de Wodestok, died before the end of the period of account, while John Godyng, John Langeford, John de Bedford, and John Newerk (or Newark) began to receive alms part way through the account. Men receiving alms at the end of the first year of Wakefield's account were also granted alms for the entire second year; only John Portour was added to the list during the second year. Shirwod, Boteman, Godyng, Langford, Bannebury, and Portour, who are named in Wakefield's account, in addition to Robert Fouler, Henry Carier, Lawrence de Kirkeby, and Nicholas Herblot were all given alms for the entire period of Beverley's account. In fact, Herblot's alms commenced before the actual accounting period; John de Mapletreewell was added after the account had begun.

The fact that an individual appears in more than one account suggests that these alms were life grants. This seems to have been the case for Robert de Wodestok, who received alms in Ypres' account and in the first year of Wakefield's until his death on 11 September 1371. Significantly, a number of the men named were household servants, appearing in either the Feoda et Robe, the Vadia Venatorum or the Vadia Falconariorum of at least one of the accounts. It is difficult to discuss the four paupers listed in Ypres' account, since only their surnames are recorded. However, Edward's servants do include men with the surnames of March and Warwick. In both years of Wakefield's account, Kyngesgrome, Ilford, Godyng, and Langeford appear in the Feoda et Robe; Shirwod is in the Vadia Venatorum and Portour in the Vadia Falconariorum. Beverley's account includes Shirwod, Godyng, Langeford, and Portour, household servants in Wakefield's account, in addition to Fouler, Kirkeby, and Herblot, who are named in Beverley's Feoda et Robe. Most individuals, such as Thomas de Ilford, received these daily alms after they had ceased to serve Edward (at least they no longer received either robes or wages), but a few, such as John Langeford, still appear in the Feoda et Robe. Nevertheless, the fact that these paupers include both former and active household servants suggests that Edward used these alms as a form of life pension, or as a supplementary grant to his servant's wages. This usage of royal alms has not hitherto been noted.

Following food allowances, Farley places entries dealing with cloth and Beverley entries concerning Edward's funeral. Farley's account will be discussed first. Of the six undated entries in his account, the one dealing with Edward's Maundy Thursday observances has already been mentioned.[20] The remaining items record the cloth offered at funeral services. These offerings are described as oblations, although they are said to be from Edward's "special alms". Two entries concern the funeral services of Roger Mortimer, earl of March, who died on 29 February 1360.[21] In the first entry 6 cloths of gold Rakem'[22] of Lucca were offered in oblations at a cost of £33 7s.3d.; the second entry reveals that a cloth of gold brocade doutr', valued at 117s.10 1/4d., was offered at Windsor. For the funeral of John de Winwick,[23] keeper of the privy seal, Edward offered 2 cloths of gold brocade of Lucca valued at £11 6s.8d. Edward offered 3 cloths of gold brocade doutr', at a value of £17 13s.6 3/4d., on 22 August, the anniversary of his mother's death.

Beverley's account is of great interest because some of its entries, especially in the Elemosina, pertain to Edward's funeral, an event almost ignored by chroniclers. Edward III died on Sunday, 21 June 1377 in his manor house at Sheen (the modern Richmond); this is noted quite simply in the Hospicium expenses by the marginal entry quo die Rex Edwardus tercius obiit. The Nuncii (Messengers) shows that on the same day two men, Simon de Burgh and William Blacomore, were sent from Sheen to Dover, presumably to take or send news of Edward's death to France. Charles V, the king of France, attended a Requiem Mass for Edward in Paris when he heard the news.

The household, stationed at Windsor, did not arrive at Sheen until a week after Edward's death, but the sharp rise in the Hospicium expenses[24] (up some £14 to about £47) on Monday, 22 June indicates that many arrived more quickly to pay their last respects. On 23 June Edward's grandson, Richard II, and Edward's son Edmund, earl of Cambridge, offered oblations of 6s.8d. and 3s.4d. respectively at a high mass celebrated for Edward's soul in the chapel within the manor of Sheen. These offerings were charged against Edward's expenses.

Roger Chaundeler, a citizen of London, would have arrived at Sheen as soon as possible after the king's death, if he was not already at court. The Elemosina reveals that he received £21 for his labours and expenses in preserving Edward's body from putrefaction with balsam and other unguents and oils.[25] The body may have been disembowled and then embalmed, the practice at the time.[26] Stephen de Hadle, a household servant, was either present at Sheen or else hurried there. He fashioned an image, that is, an effigy, of the king (pro facture unius ymaginis ad similitudinem Regis), as well as a sceptre, an orb, and a cross with a crucifix of gilt silver.

For these and other expenses Hadle received £22 4s.11d.[27] These "other expenses" may have included the coffin upon which the funeral effigy was borne. The effigy[28] consisted of a wooden torso, hollowed at the back, with a plaster head based on wood. Recent restoration of the effigy reveals that the plaster head was a death-mask; there is evidence of paralysis, the result of a stroke, on the left side of the face.[29] The account makes no mention of the apparel of either Edward's body or the effigy.

The Recepta Scaccarii states that Philip la Vache, the receiver of Edward's chamber, gave the wardrobe £1,447 towards the burial expenses on 28 June. The Elemosina expenses show that on the same day Robert de Whitbergh, Edward's almoner, distributed 100s. to paupers after a Requiem Mass for Edward's soul was celebrated at St. Paul's Cathedral in London in the presence of the archbishop of Canterbury and other dignitaries. This mass must have been celebrated without the presence of Edward's body, since it seems reasonable to suppose that the body travelled from Sheen with the household, which did not reach London until 3 July. The Hospicium expenses indicate that the household was at Sheen on the second, at St. Paul's on the third, and at Westminster on the fourth.[30] Since another Requiem Mass was celebrated for Edward in St. Paul's on 4 July and a third in Westminster on the next day, it appears that Edward's body was taken from Sheen on 3 July, and brought to London later the same day. Apparently, the body was kept overnight at St. Paul's, but on 4 July, after the mass, was moved to Westminster, where it was buried on the fifth. Perhaps the body was transported by water from Sheen to London. On 11 February 1377, while ill, Edward travelled by water from Havering to Sheen.[31] However the body was moved, it is not necessary to conclude, as does St. John Hope,[32] that the trip was made at night. The candles and torches consumed could certainly have been used during the daytime when the body lay in state since they served not necessarily as a means of lighting, but were part of a religious ceremony.[33]

On 1 July Whitbergh the almoner received £470 in three separate payments from the exchequer. The Elemosina reveals that this money was distributed for Edward's soul to paupers inter Shene at Westmonasterium per tres dies, presumably on the trips from Sheen to St. Paul's, from St. Paul's to Westminster, and at Westminster on the day he was buried. During this period paupers wearing black tunics and carrying lighted torches received alms totalling £27 15s.4d. The Prestita says that this cloth was purchased by John de Sleaford, the keeper of the great and privy wardrobes, on 28 June and 1 July at a cost of £300. An entry in the Elemosina states that 1,700 torches, 15 large candles, and 12 mortuary candles made from 8,411 pounds of wax costing £277 15s.11 1/2d. were lit around Edward's body "for 3 days between Sheen and Westminster". It seems reasonable to suppose that the large candles and the mortuary candles were not used while the body was in transit, but were placed on Edward's hearse[34] as he lay in state in St. Paul's and Westminster. The paupers who carried lighted torches could have done so while the body was in transit or when it lay in state.

On 4 July John Pope and William Campion, chandlers of London, received £11 for a hearse, as well as for the carriage of the same hearse, erected around Edward's body in St. Paul's Cathedral.[35] A Requiem Mass was celebrated in St. Paul's on the same day. Edward's son, John, duke of Lancaster, offered 6s.8d.; the earl and countess of Cambridge each gave 3s.4d. in oblations. All these offerings were charged against Edward's expenses.

The king was buried on 5 July. William Hanele erected a hearse around Edward's body in the Church of St. Peter in Westminster. Hanele received £59 16s.8d. for money paid by him in making the hearse, as well as for barriers and closets erected in the same church. Unless the barriers and closets were very expensive. this was, judging by the price, a finer hearse than the one erected in St. Paul's. Oblations to the celebrants of the Requiem Mass at Edward's funeral amounted to 2s.1d. In addition, the sacristan of the church received 20s. from Edward's alms for his labours in ringing the bells on that day.

A Requiem Mass was celebrated for Edward's soul on the _dies mensis_ (the day of month's mind)[36] in the Church of St. Peter in Westminster. The celebrants received 2s.4d. in oblations. On the same day Whitbergh distributed £25 in alms to paupers in this church. The Recepta Scaccarii reveals that he had received the money from the exchequer on 14 July. Finally, 300 large torches made from 2,084 pounds of wax costing £56 8s.10d. were lit around Edward's tomb on the dies mensis.

Hence, the sums in Beverley's account connected with the funeral, although not representing the entire cost, do indicate that Edward was buried in splendour. The Elemosina records a total expenditure of £928 9s.5 1/2d. and the Prestita another £300. Furthermore, the Hospicium expenses show that the total household expenditure on the four days of Edward's funeral celebrations, that is 3 to 6 July, was £843 4s., with £566 5s.5d. being spent on the day of the burial itself.[37]

The final entries in the Elemosina of all the accounts are those dealing with the Gascon wine granted by Edward to various religious houses for the celebrations of mass. These are the only alms recorded in Gunthorpe's account. Farley's account lists nine communities: the Dominican houses of King's Langley and Dartford; the Cistercian houses of Waverley, Coggeshall, King's Beaulieu, and St. Edward of Litterly; the Carthusian houses of Witham and Hinton; and the Benedictine house of St. Peter of Westminster. Gunthorpe's and Wakefield's accounts include these, and add the names of three additional communities - the Augustinian priory of St. Denys next to Southampton, the Cistercian house of St. Mary Graces next to the Tower of London, and the Carthusian monastery of the Holy Trinity in Beauvale. Ypres' and Beverley's accounts omit several of these communities given above, probably because they both cover less than a year, unlike the other accounts. The Carthusian house of the Annunciation of Blessed Mary in London appears only in Beverley's account. It would appear that the communities listed in the accounts of Wakefield and Gunthorpe were the normal recipients of wine during Edward's last ten years, and that the list was not yet completed in Farley's account.

Edward seems to have favoured the Dominican order. Although only two houses are listed, each community normally received four casks of wine per year; the houses of the other orders normally received only one cask. Only one account indicates when wine was granted. Beverley states that St. Mary Graces received 1 pipe (half a cask) of wine for the feast of St. George in 1377.

In summary, the Elemosina records the value of oblations and alms distributed. The oblations were either set daily oblations for the period of the account or greater oblations on certain feast days. Oblations were given not only by Edward, but also by Philippa, lord Thomas, and Joan, the lady of Brittany, as well as some others of Edward's family or minors who chanced to be at court. The alms listed in the titulus are special, being distinct from the daily alms recorded in the Hospicium expenses. The special alms include alms on certain feast days, alms to paupers, and grants of wine to religious houses.

The method of distributing oblations and alms differs dramatically between Farley's and Ypres' accounts. This may have been the result of a deliberate attempt to systematize disbursements. Judging by the total Elemosina expenses in Farley's account (about £330) and in Wakefield's (about £390 in each year),[38] the only accounts to include complete disbursements for an entire year, these changes did not result in any savings.

In Farley's account, the distribution of oblations greater than the daily set oblation on special feast days was apparently not made on any specific days. However, the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley state that on the feasts of the Epiphany, Candlemas, Good Friday, and St. John the Evangelist, Edward offered greater oblations. In Gunthorpe's account such oblations supplemented the daily set oblation, but in the other three they replaced them.

The only alms recorded in Gunthorpe's account are the grants of wine to religious houses. Farley, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley list other types of alms, but the forms differ between Farley and the three others. These four accounts state that Edward was to grant £100 yearly in special alms. Farley states that some £20 had actually been distributed, but does not say how or when this was done. The three other accounts state that the money was to be distributed equally on the feasts of Easter, Pentecost, Michaelmas or All Saints, and Christmas. However, the most dramatic change took place in the method of distributing alms to paupers. In Farley's account, they are grants of food allowances (either a meal or a sum of money) to large numbers of paupers on specified feast days. In Ypres', Wakefield's, and Beverley's accounts distribution of alms to paupers takes two forms. The first is a daily sum granted to a definite number of unnamed poor; the second is a daily sum granted to named paupers. However, since some of these named "paupers" had been, or still were, household servants, it appears that Edward used these alms as a form of pension or wage.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

[1] The total Elemosina expenses are: Farley - £328 8s. 11d.; Gunthorpe - £148 3s.8d.; Ypres - £152 9s.8d.; Wakefield (year 1) - £389 1s.5 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £399 18s.3d.; and Beverley - £1,177 11s.10 1/2d.

[2] This coin, and the one valued at 5d. offered by Philippa (see below), could not have been English since no coins of Edward III had these values.

[3] Thomas of Woodstock, Edward's youngest (sixth, but fifth surviving) son, was born on 7 January 1355. He was knighted on 23 April 1377 and was made duke of Buckingham on the day of Richard II's coronation [The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom, George E. Cokayne and Vicary Gibbs, eds., (London, St. Catherine Press, 1910-1940), vol. V. pp. 719-28].

[4] Joan (Basset), sister of John IV, duke of Brittany, who was born in November or December 1339. Edward III became the guardian of the latter, and presumably also of the former upon the death of their father on 26 September 1345 (Complete Peerage, vol. X, pp. 822-24, and vol. II, pp. 3-6).

[5] Richard Hart, ed., Ecclesiastical Records of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the Fifth Century till the Reformation, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MacMillan, Barclay, and MacMillan, 1846), p. 134.

[6] Why this was so for Edward, his wife, and son (see below) is not explained.

[7] Philippa, daughter and heiress of Lionel, duke of Clarence and earl of Ulster, Edward's second son, who died on 17 October 1368. She was born on 16 August 1355, and married Edmund Mortimer, earl of March (born 1 February 1352) about May 1368 (see n. 9 below)

[8] John de Hastings, born on 29 August 1347. His father died on 29 or 30 August 1348. He proved his age on 12 September 1368 and received possession of his father's estates. In 1359 he married Margaret, Edward's fourth daughter, who died without issue soon after 1 October 1361 (Complete Peerage, vol. X, pp. 391-94).

[9] Edmund Mortimer, born on 1 February 1352. His father died on 26 February 1360 (but see below, n.21). About May 1368 he married Philippa, Edward's grand-daughter (see n. 7 above), becoming earl of Ulster on the death of his father-in-law. On 6 January 1373, although still under age, he received his lands, and Edward took his homage and fealty (Complete Peerage, vol. VIII, pp. 445-48).

[10] The earl was Edmund of Langley, fifth (fourth surviving) son of Edward III, born on 5 June 1341. He was named earl of Cambridge on 13 November 1362. Between 1 January and 30 April 1372 he married Isabel, daughter of Pedro the Cruel of Castile and sister of Constance, who was married to his brother John, earl of Lancaster (Complete Peerage, vol. II, p. 494, and vol. XII, pp. 895-99).

[11] Raymond Crawfurd, "The Blessings of Cramp-Rings - A Chapter in the History of the Treatment of Epilepsy," Studies in the History and Methods of Science, ed. Charles Singer (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1917), pp. 167, 180.

[12] Crawfurd does not mention that the queen-consort could also bless cramp rings, although he quotes the entries in Ypres' account concerning Edward, which immediately precede those dealing with Philippa (ibid., p. 170).

[13] Crawfurd (ibid., pp. 168-69) says that "according to tradition, [the cross] was made of wood from the true Cross presented by a pilgrim to Richard Coeur de Lion; no satisfactory explanation of its name is forthcoming". However, the name Neyt, or Gneyth, as it was spelled earlier in the reign, suggests the Cross Neith, or Rood of St. Neot, a portion of the true Cross and sacred relic of the Welsh, seized by Edward I when he took Carnarvon in 1283 [L.F. Salzman, Edward I (London, Constable, 1968), p. 178].

[14] Ypres' account states that all oblations in Canterbury were in the form of gold nobles, each valued at 6s.8d.

[15] See p. 99.

[16] See pp. 105-106.

[17] See p. 86.

[18] These were Andrew and Thomas the apostle in 1359 and 1360; and, in 1360, the Ascension, Pentecost, the Nativity of John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, Jacob, Lawrence, the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Jude, and All Saints.

[19] In 1359 these were Stephen, John the Evangelist, the Holy Innocents, and Thomas the Martyr; in 1359 and 1360, Edmund the Confessor, Edmund the Martyr, Katherine, Andrew, Nicholas, the Conception of the Blessed Mary, Lucy, and Thomas the Apostle; and, in 1360, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, Candlemas, the Divine Annunciation, the Holy Trinity, Corpus Christi, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, the Translation of Thomas the Martyr, Mary Magdalene, Margaret, Jacob, Lawrence, the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, the Glorification of the Holy Cross, Matthew, Michael, Edward the Confessor, and Simon and Jude.

[20] See pp. 103-104.

[21] The Vadia Guerre (f 79v) says that the earl received war wages from 5 September 1359 "usque ultimum diem [29] Februarii quo die idem Comes obiit" (see p. 235). However, Complete Peerage, vol. VIII, p. 445, says he died on 26 February.

[22] Written Rakematz in the Necessaria (see p. 140). It is a precious cloth, embroidered, or woven, with Phrygian work [see Racamas in Charles du Frense, sieur du Cange, Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis, ed. D. P. Carpenter and G.A.L. Henschel (7 vols., 1840-1850)].

[23] He was keeper of the privy seal from before 27 November 1355 to about 17 May 1360 (Tout, Chapters, VI, p. 53). He had custody of both the privy seal and the great seal during the campaign of 1359-60, when he accompanied Edward on the continent. As the chief non-warrior at the peace negotiations at Brétigny, he probably had a great share in the negotiation and drafting of the Treaty of Brétigny. Winwick died around 12 July 1360 (ibid., III, p. 227 n. 2, and V., p. 36) when his wages ceased (see below, p. 128). See also above, p. 60.

[24] See p. 79.

[25] See p. 64.

[26] Verjuice may have been used in the embalming process (see p. 88 n.8).

[27] See pp. 66-67.

[28] William H. St. John Hope, "On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England, With Special Reference to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster", Archaeologia, vol. LX (1907), ~~pt.~~ 2, plate LVII, shows the whole effigy. R. P. Howgrave-Graham, "The Earlier Royal Funeral Effigies - New Light on Portraiture in Westminster Abbey", Archaeologia, vol. XCVIII (1961), plate XLVII, shows the face at various stages of restoration. Paul Johnson, The Life and Times of Edward III (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), pp. 197, 214-15, shows the face and the tomb effigy made from the funeral effigy.

[29] The discovery that Edward suffered a stroke is consistent with the description of the death scene in Chronicon Angliae, ab Anno Domini 1328 Usque ad Annum 1388, Auctore Monacho Quodam Sancti Albani, Edward M. Thompson, ed., (London, Rolls Series, 1874), pp. 142-46.

[30] See p. 90 n. 25, which records the daily location of the household for the period 1 to 7 July.

[31] Tout, Chapters, vol. III, p. 318 and n. 1.

[32] "On the Funeral Effigies", p. 532.

[33] Howgrave-Graham, "The Earlier Royal Funeral Effigies", p. 162.

[34] This was "a framework with a sloping roof having candle-sticks or prickets at the corners and along the sides, placed over the coffin during the burial service or watch" [John S. Purvis, Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Terms (Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson, 1962), p. 91].

[35] See p. 64.

[36] See dies and mensis in Latham, World-List, pp. 145, 195-96. A Catholic Dictionary, 3rd ed., Donald Attwater, ed. (New York, Macmillan and Co., 1961), p. 331, says that month's mind was the Requiem Mass celebrated 30 days after death or burial. In the case of Edward III it would appear to have

been celebrated on 21 July, a month after his death, because the almoner received on 14 July the money distributed to paupers on the dies mensis and because the account ceased on 26 July.

[37] The daily departmental expenses for the period 1 to 7 July are recorded on p. 90 n. 25.

[38] See n. 1 above.

CHAPTER VI

VESSELLAMENTA ARGENTI

Following Ypres' Elemosina is a unique titulus, entitled Vessellamenta Argenti (Plate of Silver), which records the descriptions and weights of silver plate purchased from the executors of the testament of Thomas Cheyne. These items include basins, ewers, drinking pots, salt-cellers, goblets, dishes, platters, spoons, a plate, and one small cruse or drinking bowl. Most of the plate is of sterling silver, although some is of silver-gilt. While most descriptions indicate that there was nothing distinctive about the items, this is not always the case. For example, the purchases included a silver-gilt goblet standing on three lions; a silver goblet, gilded on the swage, with the arms of the bishop of Lincoln on top; and a small silver-gilt cruse garnished with sterling silver.

Part of the description of the plate is its value in goldsmith's weight (per pondus aurifabrie).[1] Although the weight is expressed in terms of pounds (£), shillings (s.), and pence (d.), a pound of plate was worth more than a pound of specie.[2] Significantly, in all but the sum which gives the total weight of plate purchased, the "£" is abbreviated by the scribe as lb' rather than the customary li'; this indicates that Ypres' scribe is dealing with weights rather than with money. However, the "s." and the "d." are abbreviated in the normal manner. Although the actual monetary value is not entered for any particular piece of plate, the account does record that all the plate weighed a total of £105 13s.11d. The plate was purchased at a cost of £200 13s.9d. in money, a sum that includes not only the cost of the plate, but also the costs of making the plate.

The expenditure recorded in this titulus is not real, since the Recepta Forinseca[3] of the account reveals that the value of the plate received from the executors of the testament of Thomas Cheyne was also regarded as a receipt. This plate is listed in the inventory of plate at the end of the account; a marginal note says that it was delivered by indenture to William de Sleaford, clerk of the king's works at Westminster and the Tower.[4]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VI

[1] The term per librum Jocalium is used by some accounts. (see p. 260).

[2] Examples where both the weight and the monetary value of silver plate are known (see pp. 264, 265, 266, and 272 n. 19) indicate that one pondus aurifabrie of silver is equal to about 26s.8d. in money. At the end of the fourteenth century, one pound of silver was equivalent to 24s.2d. in money (see Reddaway and Walker, Goldsmiths' Company, p. 75).

[3] See pp. 49-50.

[4] See p. 271 n. 5.

CHAPTER VII

NECESSARIA

The Necessaria (Necessities or Sundries) includes all those expenditures which do not fall under any of the other categories in the account.[1] There are two principal types of expenditure under this heading: the payments of wages and expenses of household servants who were sent, or were staying, out of court on business, and the expenses incurred by the king's butler in the performance of his duties. Some accounts also contain expenses which deal with plate, utensils, and other miscellaneous items. Certain of these miscellaneous expenses, especially a few described as gifts, seem rightly to belong in other tituli; it is not clear why they appear in the Necessaria. Possibly the other tituli had already been prepared and it was too difficult to add the items to them.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's Necessaria also record expenditures dealing with horses. Both accounts use this heading for the purchase of horses, but only that of Gunthorpe for payments to household members whose horses had died in the king's service. In later accounts, such expenses occur in their own tituli, the Empcio Equorum and Restaurum Equorum, and the expenses dealing with horses in the Necessaria will be considered in the chapter dealing with these tituli.[2]

The Necessaria include expenses incurred before the beginning of the particular period of account. Many rightfully belong in other tituli of expenses; perhaps they appear in the Necessaria because the other tituli would normally include only expenses arising during the accounting period.

The following discussion will be based primarily upon the accounts of Farley and Gunthorpe, since these have the largest expenditures and provide the best examples of expenses placed under this titulus.

Aside from hunters and falconers, whose duties entailed their absence from court, lay household servants normally were paid wages only for the time spent in court, and these wages were recorded in the Hospicium expenses.[3] When household servants were out of court, however, their wages and expenses were recorded in the Necessaria. Two groups of servants did not receive wages - clerics received benefices and the chief lay household officers (who ranked as bannerets or knights) received yearly fees.[4] Such payments were not affected by absences from court; however, payments to cover their expenses as distinct from benefices or fees appear in the Necessaria.

All accounts record payments for the expenses of the keeper, steward, controller, and cofferer when staying out of court, either on business concerning their offices or on missions described as "the king's business". The keeper and steward received 20s. per day when absent from court, the controller 13s.4d., and the cofferer 6s.8d. Most entries give no details as to what the king's business might have been, nor do most identify any specific period when the person concerned was out of court. Generally, all the absences were grouped together. However, Gunthorpe and Ypres do not combine such expenditures. Each individual absence is recorded among the chronologically dated entries; often the reason for being out of court is given. Gunthorpe provides the most interesting examples.

Eighteen entries in his account concern the sending of Gunthorpe from wherever the king or household was staying to London to obtain money (pro denariis querendis).[5] These absences totalled 89 days. For example, the keeper was absent from court for 4 days between 1 and 10 June 1366, when sent from Windsor to London to obtain authorization from the king's council for money for household expenses. Several entries indicate that Gunthorpe personally returned with money. For example, for 6 days between 20 and 30 September Gunthorpe was out of court, having been sent from Havering to London to obtain money which he conveyed to Clarendon for the king's use. Another item shows that Gunthorpe was sent from Havering to Cranbourne to convey money for Edward's use during a hunting expendition; he was also sent from Cranbourne to London and back to collect more money. He was out of court for 7 days between 16 and 29 August; three yeomen, John Longevill, Thomas de Miton, and John Shefford, together received a reward of 20s. for accompanying the keeper and guarding the money. In at least one instance, Gunthorpe did not receive cash. He was out of court on 7, 8, and 9 October, when sent from Chertsey to London to get money in the form of tallies valued at £3,000. This is the one occasion when the amount collected is given.

In Ypres' account, one undated entry states that Richard de Beverley, the cofferer, was sent out of court to Reading for 3 days to purchase horses. Farley's Necessaria shows that Henry de Walton, the former wardrobe keeper, received £30 for his expenses in living out of court on the king's business for the period 4 October to 2 November 1359. This interval actually precedes the period of Farley's account. The latter account also shows that two successive keepers of the privy seal were paid 20s. per day while out of court. John de Winwick[6] received £43 for the period 31 May to 12 July 1360, John de Buckingham £178 for the period 1 July to 25 December 1360. In Beverley's account, the chamberlain, Roger de Beauchamp, received 20s. per day for the 47 days he was away from court. These are the only instances of such payments to the chamberlain and the keeper of the privy seal.

Payments for expenses and/or wages were granted to household servants other than the officers mentioned above. In Farley's account these payments are chiefly concerned with tasks performed on the continent. On the whole, entries can be divided into those pertaining to persons sent on Edward's business and those pertaining to the movement and transport of the household. However, two items do not fit these categories. Clement de Merk and William Gambon together received 13s.4d. for their expenses while waiting in Calais for Edward before the commencement of the Rheims campaign. An undated entry reveals that John Herlyng, a yeoman of the chamber, received £4 2s.1d. for his expenses and various other costs as he awaited Edward's arrival for the signing of the peace treaty.

Eight items in Farley's Necessaria deal with individuals sent out of court on business. In a few instances men carried letters.[7] Stephen Romylowe and Geoffrey de Styuecle were sent by Edward from Thorne to Calais to Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, at some time between 26 January and 22 April 1360. John de Elleford, king's esquire, carried letters of the king's privy seal to Cherbourg to the king of Navarre. His task occupied 19 days, and he received payment of his wages, at 6s.8d. per day, and expenses on 18 August 1360. Lord Nicholas Loveigne travelled from Calais to Edward in England with letters of prince Edward and other lords concerning the extension of the peace. Loveigne's task took 12 days; he received payment for his expenses (at 6s.8d. per day) on 8 September 1360.

Two entries deal with the expenses of men sent to the papal curia. An item dated 12 May 1360 shows that lord Adam de Hilton went to the papal curia to seek a dispensation for the marriage of the duke of Brittany and Mary, the king's daughter.[8] He received £66 13s.4d. in payment of his expenses. An undated entry indicates that lord William de Burton was sent to the papal curia on the king's unspecified business. Burton was absent the 140 days from 14 March to 31 July 1360; he received 13s.4d. per day to cover expenses.[9]

Entries in Farley's account concerning the transport of the household cover the expenses of crossing the English Channel. The recipients of money generally were not household servants, although the steward was paid £6 13s.4d. on 20 June 1360 at Honfleur for the passage of Welsh and other archers. Richard Stephan, master of the ship le James of Sandwich, received payment on 24 June 1360 for freighting the plate of the kitchen and other offices from Calais to London. On 8 July Thomas atte See, Salamonus Bottman, Alexander Hortyn, and William Denam, sailors of Dover, used three ships and a barge in conveying the king's familia (who were in the escort of the king of France), horses, and victuals from Dover to Calais. John Gerand and other sailors of Dover conveyed the king of France and other magnates to Calais from Dover on 10 July.

At the end of August 1360 the daily household expenses rose[10] as preparations were made for the arrival of the king's officials, who in turn were to prepare for the king's arrival. On 12 September, John Gerand and companions from Dover carried the lord steward and others from England to Calais (usque Cales'). Two other entries dealing with transport across the Channel are dated 12 September, but both say that the trip was from

Calais to England. Richard de Geynesburgh and his fellow mariners brought the plate and victuals of various household offices de Cal' usque London'. The treasurer and others of the king's familia, along with the bedding and other equipment of the king's chamber, were brought usque Dovorr' by William Gibbe and his campanions. If these two entries are not in error in describing the trip as being to England, they would appear to record payment for services rendered in late May and early June, when Edward's staff returned to England after the end of the military campaign.[11]

The war preparations which took place during the time of Wakefield's account are reflected in only a few items. In the first year of the account, John de Cokefeld was sent ahead of the court to prepare lodgings pro guerre in Sandwich and Porchester for the king and his familia. Cokefeld was absent for 212 days and received 12d. per day for his expenses. In the second year of the account, Cokfeld spent 95 days out of court at Sandwich and Southampton obtaining lodgings for the king and the lords of England. Finally, the first year of Wakefield's account shows that Thomas de Bernolby received two payments on the orders of a privy seal writ dated at Westminster on 16 April 1372. Bernolby was reimbursed for the 106s.4d. he paid for the repair of Edward's ship, the Redecog', and for the £52 6s.8d. he paid as a reward (rewardum) to 17 sailors of Southampton and Hamelhok on the orders of Richard de Pembroke, a knight of the chamber, and John de Ypres, controller. It is not stated how the reward was earned.

In addition to the military considerations already mentioned, domestic requirements also gave rise to the payment of wages and/or expenses. While some entries in the accounts give no explanation beyond stating that the person was on business, some reasons are recorded. These can generally be divided into two groups: expenses of persons sent out of court, and expenses resulting from the travels of the household. The following discussion will concentrate on Gunthorpe's account, partly because such expenses in Farley's account have already been considered, and partly because they occupy a larger portion of Gunthorpe's expenses than in the other accounts.

The daily wages of 3s.4d. paid Master John de Glaston, the king's physician, when sent out of court to prepare medicines "for the king's body" appear in all but Farley's account.[12] In addition, Glaston also purchased medicines "for the king's body"; these cost 108s. in Gunthorpe's account, 21s. in Ypres', £4 18s.8d. and 58s. in the two years of Wakefield's, and 16s. in Beverley's. Other individuals also purchased medicines. In the second year of Wakefield's account, medicines valued at £16 11d. were purchased by John de Sleaford, clerk of the great wardrobe, for the king and his _familia_ while they were on shipboard. The same account reveals that on 11 August 1372 medicines valued at 66s.8d. were purchased from John Leche for Edward and his _familia_ on shipboard, and that a further £4 15s. 10d. was spent on 31 July 1372 for medicines for royal use purchased from William de Wadesworth, apothecary of London.

Medicines purchased from the same man during Edward's illness cost £7 12s.8 1/2d. in Beverley's account.[13]

Gunthorpe's account reveals that Thomas de Maddyngle was sent from Windsor to London for 4 days between 1 February and 21 March 1366 to fetch cloth for the king. John Chippes, John Shefford, and others went from Windsor to London to fetch silver plate for the feasts of Easter, All Saints, and Christmas. William de Brantyngham, John de Wyght, and William Prest were sent from Windsor to Westminster with plate of gold and together received 3s.4d. on 7 May 1366.

Individuals staying out of court also received payments for wages or expenses. In Gunthorpe's account, Andrew de Tyndale, tailor of the queen's robes, received 12d. per day for his expenses in living in London for 276 days while making robes. Ypres' Necessaria indicates that Tyndale stayed out of court in London for 62 days on the queen's "secret business".

Gunthorpe's account reveals that Nicholas de Slendon, hunter, received payment of his wages (at 4d. per day) and expenses for the period 30 September to 21 December 1365, which precedes the accounting period. Simon de la Hawe, tendour, received 2 payments by writs of the privy seal given at Windsor and dated 5 June 1366 and 12 January 1367. De la Hawe was paid his wages, at 9d. per day, for the 647 days between 6 April 1365 and 12 January 1367, which partly precedes Gunthorpe's accounting period. He was also paid for a falcon, a goshawk, a tercelet-gentle, and a tercel of a goshawk taken by him for the kings' prise in the port of King's Lynn. The birds were delivered to Edward by the hands of Edmund Chesthunt, falconer. In the first year of Wakefield's account de la Hawe was paid for birds taken for the King's prise in the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk. Ypres' account indicates that Walter Rouland, falconer, received payment, on Edward's oral command, of his wages at 6d. per day for the 111 days from 25 October 1368 to 12 February 1369, a period immediately preceding the accounting period.

The movement of the household during the period of Gunthorpe's account resulted in numerous expenses. Walter Norman, king's sailor, and others received payment for conducting the queen from Chertsey to Havering by the Thames, as well as for the conveyance of her equipment by water from Chertsey to Barking, between 4 and 16 July 1366. Hanekinus Croft, king's yeoman, and non-household yeomen were paid for hauling two barges and one boat belonging to the king from Barking to Sheen, and from Sheen to Chertsey, between 23 and 30 September. Roger Smale received wages of 3s.10d. for his round trip from Windsor to Shipton with the king's wardrobe (garderoba). Smale was also out of court for 40 days between 20 August and 30 October when sent from Havering to Westminster and Sheen with the "equipment" (hernesium) of the kings' wardrobe of robes (garderoba robarum).[14] Lawrence Lok received 3d. per day for his wages while staying out of court at Windsor for 82 days from 23 June to 12 September to guard Philippa's wardrobe after her familia had gone to Havering. John de Bedford and John Kembald were each paid a similar amount for guarding the queen's chamber and wardrobe of robes.

The first year of Wakefield's account reveals that John Fyssh, John Botesham, and William de Upton, yeoman, on two separate occasions were sent from Windsor to Winton and Marlborough with the bed hangings and equipment of the wardrobe and with 100 "suits" (hernesii) of armour for 100 men-at-arms. For guarding the equipment, as well as for preparing for the arrival of the king's familia in these two places and for returning with the equipment to Windsor and London, they were paid 66s.8d. on 20 October 1371.

Ypres', Wakefield's, and Beverley's accounts state that, by Edward's special grace, two men were the recipients of lifetime wages. Richard Bosevill and Robert de Appulby, king's sergeants-at-arms, received wages of 12d. per day, both in and out of court, for the entire periods of accounts. They also received normal robe allowances.

All wardrobe books record payments of expenses incurred in the compiling writing and rendering of the household accounts. In Gunthorpe's £20, and in Wakefield's £40, were granted to the clerks who wrote the accounts of the keeper and the controller. Ypres' account shows that £26 13s.4d. was paid to the clerks who drew up the accounts for his accounting period (13 February to 27 June 1369) and for the preceding accounting year (13 February 1368 to 12 February 1369). In Farley's and Beverley's accounts the keeper also received money.

Farley was paid the enormous sum of £266 13s.4d. for his expenses and those of various clerks while staying in London for 1 1/2 years to draw up the account. The fact that the wardrobe book records the accounts of the clerk of the great wardrobe and the king's butler, as well as the wages for Edward's French expendition, was taken into consideration when granting Farley this large sum. Beverley received £133 6s.8d. for his expenses and those of the clerks who stayed, presumably in London, for 218 days between 27 July 1377 and 9 July 1379, to draw up the accounts of Beverley and William de Moulsoe, the former keeper. Beverley's expenses and labours during the time of Edward's funeral were taken into consideration. In addition, 100s. was granted to the clerks who wrote the accounts.

The expenses of making or repairing plate are found in the Necessaria of Gunthorpe's, Ypres', and Wakefield's accounts. For example, Gunthorpe reveals that Thomas de Hassey, king's goldsmith and citizen of London, made or repaired silver or gold dishes, goblets, and other pieces of plate. Hassey was paid £787 5s.10d., which includes payment for the metal used, as well as the costs of making, repairing, or stamping the plate. Ypres' account shows that Joan de Hassey,[15] wife of Thomas de Hassey, was paid £46 14s.5d. for 24 silver dishes. In the first year of Wakefield's account Robert Launde, a London goldsmith, repaired the king's great seal, on the order of the treasurer, at a cost of 6s.8d.

The Necessaria in Gunthorpe's and the first year of Wakefield's accounts reveal that certain utensils and victuals were purchased for the household. In Gunthorpe's account Robert Rosse delivered bronze pots, copper bowls, pans, and stone mortars to the household stationed at Windsor. Rosse also delivered a gridiron, 2 ladles and 2 skimmers of latten, and one shave of iron to the king's hypocaust or hot bath (pro Stuph' Regis) at Windsor. Coffers for the king's cofferer and the offices of the saucery and pantry and one chest for the controller were purchased from Thomas de Staunden, cofferer of London, at a cost of 76s.8d. A pair of knives purchased from William de Retteford for the queen's table for the feast of Christmas cost 40s.

In the first year of Wakefield's account, Robert Rosse delivered 3 cooking pots and 6 basins and ewers to the household of the king on shipboard. Margery de Shadwell received 26s.8d. for a case of black leather, made for a large silver jar in which were kept the king's alms.

Gunthorpe's account records the purchase of certain victuals. John Mulward of Stanwell was paid 42s.4d. owed him for unspecified victuals obtained for the household. Roger Slak delivered 3 casks of honey to John de Foxle, constable of the castle on the Isle of Sheppey, and Randolf Martyn 8 casks of honey to Thomas Cheyne, constable of Windsor Castle. This honey cost £122. John atte Welle delivered wood costing £32 8d. to the palace of Westminster, the manor of Gravesend, the castle of Hadleigh, and Windsor Park for the king's use in his secret visits to these places.

Farley's account alone records expenses incurred by the great wardrobe, the privy wardrobe, and the king's butler. The great wardrobe[16] had originally developed out of the wardrobe of the household; the privy wardrobe[17] in turn developed out of the great wardrobe, although it was also closely related to the chamber. During the period covered by this thesis the great wardrobe was concerned primarily with the purchase and storage of non-perishable commodities such as cloth, fur, and wax; the privy wardrobe stored and manufactured arms and armour. Although partly dependent on the great wardrobe, by 1360 the privy wardrobe was essentially an independent organization, receiving its revenues from, and accounting to, the exchequer. The king's butler[18] was the official who provided all the wines required by the king, including that used in the household.

Originally accountable to the wardrobe of the household, the great wardrobe and the king's butler were removed from household control in 1324, when it was required that the keeper of the great wardrobe and the butler should receive all their money from, and should account to, the exchequer.[19] The only exception was that the butler still accounted to the wardrobe for the wines he delivered to the household. Until 1351 this directive was fairly well maintained,[20] but between 1351 and 1360 the great wardrobe and the king's butler reverted to their former dependence upon the wardrobe of the household.

The reason for this development is not clear; it may have had something to do with the war in France. The close of Farley's account saw the end of wardrobe control over the offices of the great wardrobe and the king's butler, which thereafter accounted to the exchequer. Whether the privy wardrobe also accounted to the wardrobe of the household during the period 1351 to 1360 is not certain. However, entries in the Recepta Scaccarii[21] would suggest that, at least for the period of Farley's account, the privy wardrobe accounted to the great wardrobe. This development presumably took place because of the war; it may have been in effect only for the duration of Farley's account.

John de Newbury, clerk of the great wardrobe, received £54 8s.6 1/4d. to pay the wages of his clerks and yeomen, and to cover the expenses of transporting spices, napery, linen cloth, canvas, and "other things"; of making barrels in which to store the spices; of shearing and fulling cloth; and of sewing linen cloths. Newbury also received his annual "ancient" fee of £20 and a further reward or regard (rewardum) of £66 17s.6 1/2d. for the period 2 January to 1 November 1360 out of an annual sum of £80. Henry de Snaith, clerk of the king's privy wardrobe, received 32s. for the repair of various things pertaining to his office, and £7 12s. for his wages at 12d. per day from 1 June to 1 November 1360.

The costs of commodities bought by the great and privy wardrobes are also recorded. Certain goods, such as cloth, were purchased for the king's personal use (pro corpore Regis), although most were delivered to Edward's servants. However, 6 cloths of gold Rakematz[22] costing £34 were delivered to the king at Havering for his own personal use. Wax, spices, napery, linen cloth, canvas, and "other things", valued at almost £70, were delivered to lord William de Clee and Walter Whithors for the king's private expenses at Westminster and Rotherhithe. Cloth, fur, mercery, and "other things" costing some £500 were delivered to John Marreis, Edward's tailor. Velvet Camaka[23] cloth of gold and "other things" were delivered to Gerard le Heaumer, yeoman, smith of the king's weapons (faber armorum Regis), for covering the king's plate and armour. Saddles, bridles, halters, and other "harnesses" were delivered to Thomas Spigurnell, keeper of the king's great horses. John de Coloigne and William de Glendale, successive armourers of the king, and Thomas de Thorneton, pavilioner, received unspecified things. Items for the "king's body" cost some £1,280; nearly half was spent on deliveries to the armourers.

Expenses incurred by the subordinate personnel of the great and privy wardrobes appear in the account. The tailor Marreis received some £33 for his expenses in making garments. The king's armourers, Coloigne and Glendale, were paid some £182 for their expenses in making bedding, standards, streamers, small banners, and "other things". The pavilioner and the keeper of the king's great horses received some £23 and 6s.8d.

respectively for expenses arising from the repair of articles pertaining to their offices. Hugh Penitour, king's painter, received almost £137 for his costs in painting large shields, standards, small banners, streamers, and "other things".

An expenditure which perhaps pertains to the great or privy wardrobe shows that Edmund Rose was paid £40 7s.[24] for purchasing cloaks, doublets, leggings, and linen cloth for Richard Vinegre and Richard Verius, king's henchmen,[25] for halters for the king's horses, for other necessities, and for renting a house for the safe custody of Rose's unidentified office.

The Necessaria of the various accounts contain the expenses incurred by the king's butler. Farley records those arising from the purchase and purveyance of all the wine required by the king; the other four accounts include only those expenses pertaining to the provision of wine for the household. The expenses recorded in the Necessaria do not include the value of the wine actually purchased for, or consumed by, the household. These appear in the Hospicium expenses. One entry records the butler's fees, the wages of his servants, and the expenses arising from the transport and storage of wine purchased by the butler. In Farley's account John de Stodey, the butler, was allowed £924 5s.2. William Street received £409 7s.2d. in Gunthorpe's account, £81 15s.3 1/2d. in Ypres', and £205 15s.7 1/2d. and £197 16s.8d 1/2d.

in the two years of Wakefield's. Geoffrey Newton was paid £164 3 1/2d. in Beverley's account.

The value of wine used by the butler to make good any ullage and leakage[26] of the casks of wine which came into his custody is listed as an expense. These costs amount to about £525 in Farley's account, £280 in Gunthorpe's, £30 in Ypres, £340 and £315 in Wakefield's, and £90 in Beverley's. In addition, both Gunthorpe and Ypres note that some £50 and £4 respectively was spent in making good spillage (in fusura) and leakage of wine used in the household.

Wine which went bad was sold at a loss. No expenditure of this sort occurs in Ypres' account; it amounts to some £675 in Farley's, £260 in Gunthorpe's, £275 and £355 in Wakefield's, and £50 in Beverley's. The value of wine lost is also recorded as an expense. For example, Farley's account reveals that 74 casks of Gascon wine valued at about £395 were lost on a sandbar called la Grillere in the mouth of the Thames, while Vernaccia and Malmsey wine worth some £30 was seized by the French at Winchelsea. Beverley's account shows that 3 casks of Gascon wine, valued at some £18, in the custody of John de Chichestre, lieutenant of the butler in Weymouth, were destroyed when the galleys burned. However, this entry is cancelled because it was without any warrant; the sum is charged as a prest against the butler.[27]

Wines consumed by the king and his familia when out of court are listed as expenses in the Necessaria. During Farley's keepership 7 casks of Gascon wine costing some £37 were consumed on shipboard by the king and his familia between Honfleur and England. Wines consumed by Edward, and others, when he was out of court at his residences at Sheen and Sheppey cost over £33 in Gunthorpe's account. Several accounts record the costs of wines stored in Westminster and consumed by Edward and his council during the king's secret visits. For example, Gascon, Flurr', Malmsey, and Vernaccia wine worth some £28 was used in this manner in Ypres' account.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts include several bookkeeping entries dealing with wines. Farley records as an expense the purchase price (£19 3s.) of 2 pipes of Rhenish wine which were sold because the wine had gone bad. However, a receipt of £8 14s.2d. is recorded in the Recepta Forinseca.[28] Therefore, the net loss is actually £10 8s.10d. Similarly, the household paid the butler £181 8s.10d. for 68 casks of white Gascon wine. This wine was part of a larger consignment received by the butler by forfeiture at Dartmouth and later sold. The receipt was credited to the butler in the Recepta Forinseca. Thus, the wardrobe actually recorded as an expense money paid to itself. Gunthorpe's account has two entries dealing with the sale of 78 casks 1 pipe of unused Gascon wine. The first item records an expense of £213 8s.4d., but this is a cross entry, since the identical sum is credited to the butler in the Recepta Forinseca. The second entry records the actual loss of £259 17s.5 1/2d. In addition, Gunthorpe's account lists as an expense the costs of prise wines taken by the butler. This wine was sold and the receipt, which exceeds the expense, appears in the Recepta Forinseca.

All the accounts indicate that a yearly fee of 12 casks of Gascon wine was given to the chancellor of England. William de Edington, bishop of Winchester, and Simon Langham, bishop of Ely, each received 12 casks valued at £64 12d. and £72 7s. respectively during their chancellorships in Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts. For the period of Ypres' account, William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, as chancellor was given 9 casks of wine valued at £45 13s.6d. Robert de Thorp, knight, received his chancellor's fee of 12 casks of wine valued at £100 18s.6d. for the first year of Wakefield's account; in the second year Thorp received his fee for the period 28 June to 5 July 1372, while his successor, John Knyvet, knight, received his fee from 6 July 1372 to 27 June 1373. The wine cost £102 6s. In the period of Beverley's account, Knyvet received his fee for 7 weeks; his successor, Adam Houghton, bishop of St. David's, received his fee for 23 weeks. The total cost was £41 17 1/2d. In addition, an entry found only in Farley's account shows that the chancellor was given 11 1/2 pounds of wax per week for his fee. For the period from the feast of All Saints 1359 to All Saints 1360, this amounted to 598 pounds, at a total cost of £19 15s.4d.

Two accounts show that spoiled victuals were sold at a loss. For example, the second year of Wakefield's account reveals that victuals purchased for Edward's voyage and allowed to spoil were sold at a loss of £84 5 1/2d. The same account shows that 8 casks of flour which had rotted at sea were delivered to the almoner. The value of the flour lost and the cost of its previous transport from Salisbury to Southampton amounted to about £25.

Several accounts contain miscellaneous expenses. In Farley's account, for example, lord Roger de Beauchamp and Robert de Erhuth were reimbursed on 28 October 1360 for the £53 7s.11d. paid by them for the expenses of Lionel and Edmund, the king's sons, in living at Boulogne in Ostag' for 10 days.[29] John Wodrove, the king's confessor, and his companion were granted 116s. for their "small necessities" for the feasts of Christmas 1359 and Pentecost 1360.

Gunthorpe's account also has some miscellaneous entries. On Edward's command at Beaulieu, the sum of 26s.8d. was paid Simon de Burgh on 20 July 1366 for the expenses of the son of the king of Lithuania[30] between Breamore and London. [illegible]an de Samford was paid £326 for cloth, and John Clerc and Roger de Alby, skinners of London, were paid £264 18 1/2d. for furs and ermine skins purchased for the queen's livery for Christmas 1366. A silver dish worth 50s.11d. was dropped into the Thames, in Edward's presence, by William de Notyngham, page of the kitchen. The value of the plate was pardoned to Notyngham by a privy seal writ given at Windsor Castle on 15 January 1367. John de Conyngesby, purveyor of the household, was forgiven by the king's council the £276 18s.11d. he was in arrears from the £693 11s.8 1/2d. received by him from the third penny[31] for the purchase of oxen and mutton. He was unable to account for the whole sum because of the dearness of animals, the immense household expenses in the summer and during hunting trips, and "other causes". However, an addition states that, nevertheless, the sum was charged against Conyngesby, because the keeper had to account for the whole amount.

The second year of Wakefield's surviving account shows that £47 13s.4 1/2d. was lost by the keeper, and claimed as an expense, from the superplusagium (that is, the balance in his favour) of his earlier account (covering the period 27 June 1369 to 26 June 1371). The expense was disallowed at the audit because it had been allowed "in the foot of the [previous] account". This would appear to have been a deliberate attempt to claim the same expense twice.

The Necessaria is concerned with two types of expense: payments of expenses and/or wages of household members out of court, and the expenses of the king's butler. These constitute almost the entire expenditure. Only in the accounts of Farley and Gunthorpe does the Necessaria make reference to large expenditures on items other than wages and wine. These include the purchase of plate, utensils, and victuals for the household; of cloth, fur, and other commodities for royal use; and of horses, as well as for the restitution of horses which had died in Edward's service. In addition, Farley's account contains the expenses of the great and privy wardrobes and the king's butler, offices which were temporarily subordinate to the wardrobe of the household.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VII

[1] The total expenses are: Farley - £6,159 14s.1d.; Gunthorpe - £4,068 17s.5d.; Ypres - £505 6s. 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 1) - £1,702 3s.5 3/4d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £1,408 9s.1d.; and Beverley - £906 9s.4 1/2d.

[2] See Chapter VIII.

[3] The wages of hunters and falconers appear in the *Vadia Venatorum* and the *Vadia Falconariorum* (see Chapter XII).

[4] See p. 162.

[5] See pp. 22-23.

[6] See pp. 108, 119 n. 23.

[7] See p. 206.

[8] She was his fourth daughter, born at Walton near Winchester on 10 October 1344. She married the duke in the summer of 1361, but died 30 weeks later (*Complete Peerage*, vol. X, pp. 822-24).

[9] See p. 191.

[10] See p. 78.

[11] Tout's statement (*Chapters*, IV, p. 145 n.1) that "the steward, treasurer and others arrived [in Calais] on Sept. 12" certainly assumes scribal error.

[12] He was absent 22 days in Gunthorpe's account, 9 in Ypres', 67 and 68 in the two years of Wakefield's, and 7 in Beverley's.

[13] See pp. 64-65.

[14] See pp. 82, 294.

[15] See p. 264.

[16] See Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 132-33, 428-37.

[17] Ibid., IV, pp. 439-84.

[18] See p. 24 and Tout, Chapters, III, p. 179; IV, pp. 132-33, 159 n. 1.

[19] See Tout, Chapters, II, p. 264.

[20] Ibid., IV, p. 431.

[21] See p. 25.

[22] See pp. 108, 119 n. 22.

[23] "A fine material, (probably) silk" (Latham, Word-List, p. 64).

[24] See pp. 58, 236.

[25] A henchman (henxstmann'), who ranked as a yeoman palfreyman, attended the king in processions.

[26] Ullage is the amount that a wine cask lacked of being full; leakage is the amount spilled during transport.

[27] See pp. 253-54.

[28] See pp. 45-46 for this and following references to the Recepta Forinseca.

[29] The two, along with their brother Edward, accompanied king John of France to Boulogne, when the latter left Calais on 25 October after his release (Barnes, Edward the Third, pp. 605-606).

[30] He had been captured by Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, on the feast of All Saints 1364. The captured prince became a Christian, adopting the christian name of his captor and godfather.. They came to England from Prussia in late 1365 (Barnes, Edward the Third, pp. 661, 669).

[31] This was a third of the profits of royal justice in the counties, towns, and cities.

CHAPTER VIII

EMPCIO EQUORUM AND RESTAURUM EQUORUM

Payments for the purchase of horses appear in all accounts with the exception of the second year of Wakefield; payments for horses lost in the king's service appear in all accounts. As already mentioned, the accounts of Farley and Gunthorpe enter the costs of horses purchased in the *Necessaria*. Their *Dona* and Gunthorpe's *Necessaria* contain payments made for horses lost. The other accounts have special *tituli*, the *Empcio Equorum* (Purchase of Horses) and the *Restaurum Equorum* (Compensation for Horses Lost), for these expenses. Since Farley's and Gunthorpe's are the earliest of the accounts under study, it would appear that these special *tituli* were not yet in household accounting use when these two accounts were drawn up.[1]

Horses were generally bought for the domestic needs of the household, although nearly all the horses purchased in the first year of Wakefield's account were to be used in the war effort with France.[2] These latter horses will be discussed separately. In Gunthorpe's account all horses purchased, and in Wakefield's those destined for the war effort, were delivered to the avener, the household official responsible for their care and feeding,[3] who would then assign them to carters and other servants requiring animals. Some of the horses purchased during the period of Farley's account were obtained in France since Edward was campaigning. In the other accounts, horses were bought in England.

Most horses purchased were destined to pull the household carts. Two types of cart can be distinguished: the _chariota_ and the _carecta_. The former was for personal transport, the latter for the transport of goods and equipment. Gunthorpe records that £4 6s.9d. was paid to Richard de Sutton for a grey horse purchased from him and delivered to the avener for the _chariota_ of Adam Chadle. In Beverley's account, Robert atte Celer received 53s.4d. for a brown-grey horse which was delivered to Walter Brewer for his _carecta_.

Normally the names of the carters receiving the horses are given. However, in Farley's account two horses are described simply as "for the king's cart" (_carecta_). In one instance only is it specifically stated what the carts were hauling. Gunthorpe shows that three horses were purchased for the cart of the queen's bedding.

Gunthorpe's account shows that sumpter, or pack, horses were also purchased. They were to carry the king's tents and saddle-bags of fur, as well as the queen's chamber, bedding, and jewels. One sumpter horse was delivered to the pantry which accompanied the king when he was out of court (_pro somario Panetrie pro Rege per se_). In Farley's account horses were bought for the transport (_pro cariagio_) of the household offices of the spicery and bakery. Some were also purchased for the transport of the personal effects of the king; they are described as "for the king's jewels" and "for the king's chamber". These horses may have been sumpter horses.

Most horses are described merely as equi, but several specific kinds of horse are mentioned. In Gunthorpe's account, a maler' costing £5 was bought for Edward's son Thomas. Farley's account shows that five mares were bought from Thomas Flemmyng, at a total cost of 40s., to transport the equipment of the office of the bakery. The same account reveals that three coursers (cursarii) were purchased. One of these, costing £26 13s.4d., was obtained from John Hart between 26 January and 22 April 1360. It had belonged to Roger Mortimer, earl of March, who died on 29 February, and had been used for his standard (pro vexillo). Two horses in Farley's account purchased for the large sum of £66 13s.4d. may have been coursers; they were perhaps bought for Edward's personal use since they are described as ad opus Regis.

Beverley's account contains three entries indicating that horses were purchased for the king's storeroom (pro cella) in London. On 12 March 1377, John de Yakesle received £40 for a courser called (vocatus) "dapple-grey Yakesley" purchased from him plus an additional £6 for a trotter. John Hattfeld was paid £26 13s.4d. on 3 June for a palfrey called (vocatus) "dapple-grey Hattfeld". These three horses were purchased by Robert Bardolf; the Recepta Scaccarii states that he was paid for them at the exchequer on 11 March and 3 June.[4] To what use these horses were put is not stated.

The first year of Wakefield's account records the greatest number of horses purchased and the largest expenditure. Of the 462 horses bought at a cost of some £1,275, all but 6 costing £18 were obtained for military use (ad opus Regis pro guerre). The six horses bought for the household became cart horses. The others were delivered to the avener to become sumpter and cart horses for the king's chamber and various household offices. This would suggest that the horses were not intended for service on the continent, but were to be used to transport the household and supplies to the place of embarkation. The account does not state what became of these horses on Edward's failure to reach France, but it is significant that no Empcio Equorum appears in the second year of Wakefield's account.

The purchase of horses for military purposes was done by six commissions. Four of these commissions were composed of two men each, one of whom was a household servant. The other two commissions consisted of only one man in each case. All these agents probably were household servants; only two cannot be identified as such. One of the two, a Thomas Stafford, appears in the Recepta Scaccarii, where he is stated to have received £100 on 29 April 1372 from the collectors of customs in Kingston-upon-Hull against the purchase of horses for the war.

Only one entry actually states where horses were purchased; Thomas Spigurnell was paid for the horses he bought at Stamford Fair. Most entries do record the names of the vendors' home towns. These names suggest that each commission visited certain areas. It looks as if the commissions purchased most, if not all, of their horses at fairs; entries recording purchases from persons living in the same town often occur with intervening entries. However, it is impossible to be certain since the only dated payments are those for horses purchased for purely domestic needs.

As in other accounts, most horses purchased under Wakefield were not specified as to type. Occasionally, however, the commissions purchased coursers, amblers, and trotters.[5] These presumably did not become sumpter or cart horses. For example, Simon de Bukenahm and Peter de Bury were paid £19 6s.8d. for one black ambler and two grey trotters with stars, purchased from William, the rector of Clenchwarton. Thomas Spigurnell was paid £17 6s.8d. for a grey courser purchased from Adam Wace. The value of the individual animals ranged from 17s. for a bay horse to £18 for a black trotter. Robert Bonde of Fyspath' supplied the largest group of horses purchased from one individual; he was paid £53 6s.8d. for 18 horses.

It was Edward's responsibility to provide a household servant with compensation when that servant's horse died in his service. Payments "in compensation" are described as in restauro and occur in all but Farley's account.[6] However, Farley's and Gunthorpe's Dona also contain payments "in compensation", although the phrase in restauro is not used.

It is never stated what services household servants were performing when their horses died. An entry in Gunthorpe's account shows that he received compensation for his dead horse at Windsor on 22 January 1367. The Necessaria reveals that between 12 and 22 January of that year Gunthorpe had been sent from Windsor to London to obtain money. Presumably, Gunthorpe's horse died during the execution of this mission. John Clisseby received compensation for his dead horse on 19 June 1366 at Chertsey. The Dona reveals that in the last two weeks of June the king and queen were at Chertsey. Clisseby may have lost his horse while in personal attendance upon Edward and Philippa.

Compensation was made only to household servants. In all cases the sum granted was 40s., regardless of the rank of the owner of the dead horse and, apparently, the value of the dead horse. Those receiving the 40s. in the various accounts include the keeper of the wardrobe, the controller, clerks and sergeants of the offices, and esquires. No one of a rank lower than esquire is found receiving such a payment. Perhaps servants of lower ranks did not own horses or perhaps the king had no similar obligations towards them.

The second year of Wakefield's account contains a unique payment. Robert Erhuth, a sergeant of the household, received 40s. at Langley on 9 May 1373 "in compensation" for a bay cart horse which was delivered to the king's almoner. In this case the horse was alive, not dead, although the formula in restauro was employed and Erhuth received the normal payment of 40s. for a horse lost in the king's service. Perhaps the horse had been purveyed by the almoner.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's Dona contain the expenses of the restitution of servants' horses that died in the king's service, but, as has been noted, the formula in restauro was not employed. Farley's Dona contains four payments, totalling nearly £25, "in recompense" (in recompensacionem) for horses which had died. It is not actually stated that the horses died in Edward's service, but this is probable since in three of the four instance they died in France or Calais. It may be that the service was non-military since the costs of replacing horses lost in the war effort seem to be recorded at great extent in the Vadia Guerre. Lord Andrew Luterell, living at Calais and going to France, was granted £6 13s.4d. on 3 November 1359 for his dead horse which could have died before actual hostilites began. Payments in Farley's Dona would appear to represent the actual value of the lost horse, or the cost of a replacement.

Farley's Dona records gifts "in payment" (in persolucionem) or "in subsidy" (in subsidium) of horses which had been, or were about to be, purchased. They do not seem to have been payments in compensation for the loss of horses and may not have been gifts at all, but payments for horses purchased or to be purchased. For example, lord John de Beurle received a gift of £20 "in subsidy" of a courser to be bought by him; lord Simon Basset received £10 in payment for a horse purchased by him.

In Gunthorpe's Dona, two household servants received 40s. each for a dead horse, but the payments were described "as a reward" (pro rewardo) and "in recompense". It is not clear why these payments were considered to be gifts, but both recipients were of ranks lesser than an esquire.

With the exception of Farley's account, most of the entries dealing with horses record the horses' descriptions or colourings. The Empcio Equorum of the first year of Wakefield's account is especially rich in varied and detailed descriptions; the examples of the descriptions of horses given below are all drawn from this account unless otherwise stated.

Descriptions range from one-word colour definitions to ones more complex. Bay and grey horses appear most frequently, but ashen-grey, black, chestnut, and white horses are common. Horses with varying colour combinations, but especially of black and grey, and of grey and white, appear from time to time. Some horses are iron-grey, fallow, and dun. A few, as well as being described as to their colour, are said to be sorrel, brindled or dappled, or piebald. Occasionally, the clerk writing the descriptions could think of no suitable Latin word. In such instance he resorted to "English" words, such as bronbay (or brounbay), sorbay, horgray, and falowe.

Occasionally, horses are described as having distinctive markings. Some had stars. Wakefield's account records the purchase of a sorrel horse with a star; in Gunthorpe's account, a horse had a star in fronte. Many horses were marked by streaks. One ashen-grey horse had a black streak; another had both a star and a streak. In some cases, colour differences between feet, head, and body are noted. A grey horse had a piebald head; a grey-black horse had a white head; and a white horse had a brindled head. A number of horses had white feet. A black-piebald horse had three white feet; a black-grey horse had white forelegs; and the hind feet of a black horse were white.

Beverley's account, as has been noted, refers to a courser called (vocatus) "dapple-grey Yakesley" and a palfrey called "dapple-grey Hattfeld". These may be the names of the horses; however, since they were bought from John de Yakesle and John Hattfeld, the phrases may only be descriptive. Gunthorpe's account records that the queen was presented on behalf of the king with a white courser called (vocatus) "Blanchard Kyng". This would appear to have been the horse's name.

Expenses dealing with horses are found in all of the accounts. The household constantly needed horses, except in the second year of Wakefield's account. The large numbers purchased for the war effort in the first year of the account seem to have left the household with all, perhaps more, than it needed. The purchases in the first year of Wakefield's account show that while the household was becoming more and more simply the domestic organization of the king, it could still be used for the needs of war. All accounts contain payments for the loss of horses in the king's service by household members of the rank of esquire or above. The compensation was a flat payment of 40s., regardless of the value of the horse lost or the rank of the owner. The exception here is Farley's account in which such payments seem to be for the actual value of the horse, perhaps because the war with France had been renewed. In Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts, the tituli Empcio Equorum and Restaurum Equorum were not in use; expenses for horses appear in the Necessaria and in the Dona.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

[1] Entries dealing with the purchase of horses in Farley's account were scattered among the other Necessaria expenses, but in Gunthorpe's were kept separate from other Necessaria expenditures. In the latter account, entries recording the buying of horses were collected in chronological order, at the end of the Necessaria; they follow the item recording the expenses of compiling and writing the wardrobe book, the last entry in the titulus in the other accounts. However, payments in compensation for horses lost in Gunthorpe's account were recorded among the other Necessaria expenses.

[2] The total expenses are: Farley - £204 2s.4d. for 40 horses; Gunthorpe - £151 19s.5d. for 46 horses; Ypres - £9 6s.8d. for 3 horses; Wakefield (year 1) - £1,276 4s.2d. for 462 horses (all but 6 horses costing £18 were purchased for the war); and Beverley - £79 6s.8d. for 6 horses.

[3] He was also responsible for the purchase and upkeep of carts, harnesses, etc. Expenditures incurred by the avener were recorded under the heading Stabulum in the Hospicium expenses.

[4] See p. 29.

[5] Coursers, of course, were war horses. Presumably, amblers and trotters are horses trained so that ambling and trotting were their natural gaits.

[6] The totals are £32 in Gunthorpe's account, £12 in Ypres', £30 and £20 in the two years of Wakefield's, and £14 in Beverley's.

CHAPTER IX

FEODA, ROBE, ET CALCIATURA

The king's household servants were granted yearly issues of fees, robes, or footwear. Such expenses were listed in one section in the wardrobe books. The folios comprising this section in the various accounts have different titles, such as Feoda et Robe or Robe et Calciatura, depending upon the contents of the folio. In Ypres' account, titles are quite specific, such as Calciatura Valletorum Regine. Several folios in both years of Wakefield's account record the composite title Feoda, Robe, et Calciatura (Fees, Robes, and Footwear).

Fees were paid to certain household members either in lieu of wages or because of the offices which they held. Most household members were entitled to an issue, or livery, of robes and/or footwear. The normal practice was for the issue to be made in money, not in actual clothing or shoes.[1] The recipients of these payments are normally named.

In general, the sections commence with the allowances granted to the highest ranking household members and work down to the lowest ranking servants receiving allowances. The highest ranking servants received a robe allowance, the median ranks a robe and shoe allowance, and the lowest in rank money for shoes only.

These sections provide a partial list of household members during the period of each of the accounts under study. A full list, however, cannot be made. Grooms and pages are not listed because they received neither robes nor footwear. The lowest ranking servants mentioned are the yeomen palfreymen and sumptermen. Household servants absent from court when liveries officially were made did not normally receive the allowance to which they would otherwise have been entitled.[2] Outriders to the household carts received their allowances from the carter of their cart and so are unnamed.

It also appears that many of the officials, such as the cofferer and controller, and perhaps others such as clerks of the various offices, hired their own clerks to assist them in their duties.[3] These were not official members of the royal household, even if they were physically a part of it. What remuneration and perquisites they received came from the person who hired them, not from the king. Consequently, these individuals do not appear under the sections concerned with fees, robes, and footwear.

The wages paid household members are recorded in the Hospicium expenses, the Vadia Venatorum, or the Vadia Falconariorum.[4] However, not all household members received wages. Clerks were normally presented with benefices. The major lay household officers, namely the bannerets[5] and knights, were too dignified to receive wages. Instead, they received fixed yearly fees; these payments are recorded in the present titulus.

Fees were granted in equal portions twice yearly at Easter and Michaelmas.[6] In addition to fees, bannerets and knights were given robes.

Bannerets received a yearly fee of £13 6s.8d. (20 marks); knights (or knights of the chamber as they are described in several accounts) received £6 13s.4d. (10 marks). The steward of the household was a banneret in all but Gunthorpe's account. The latter records no bannerets, but does list 6 knights, one of whom is the steward, John de la Lee. John de Charleton and Robert de Aston, chamberlains, received the fees of a banneret in Farley's and Beverley's accounts respectively, the only accounts in which the chamberlain is mentioned. Ypres and Wakefield record the presence of only one banneret, the steward; Beverley lists 2, the steward and the chamberlain. Farley's account reveals that 7 bannerets and 19 knights received fees, although this does not represent all of the bannerets and knights listed in the titulus. It is not clear why some of the bannerets and knights did not receive fees. It may be that those who did not were temporary additions to the staff.[7] Six knights are named in Ypres' account, 4 and 3 in the two years of Wakefield's, and 3 in Beverley's. The knights include Roger la Warde, guardian of Edward's son Thomas, in Gunthorpe's account, and the controller of the household when he was a layman, such as John de Ypres in Wakefield's accounts.

In addition to, but distinct from, fees paid to household bannerets and knights in lieu of wages, are those paid to household servants to cover expenses they incurred because of their offices. Such fees appear in all accounts but Farley's. The household launderers and laundresses were paid for their yearly supply of wood and ashes. The laundress of the chambers of Thomas and Joan, the lady of Brittany, received 13s.4d. yearly in Gunthorpe's account. All other accounts show that other launderers or laundresses received either 20s. or 26s.8d. for their yearly fees. In Gunthorpe's account the laundress of the queen's chamber and of the napery and vestments of the chapel received 26s.8d. per year; the launderer or laundress of the king's chamber received 20s. in Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts. The laundress of the napery of the household received 20s. yearly in Gunthorpe's account, but the launderer of the napery in Wakefield's and Beverley's received 26s.8d. Finally, Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts indicate that the seamstress of the queen's chamber and of the vestments of the king's and queen's chapel received a yearly fee of 6s.8d. for her thread.[8]

The king provided most of his household staff with a yearly livery of robes and/or footwear, or, more often, a money payment. The value or quality of the livery depended upon the rank of the recipient. The servant did not necessarily receive his allowance when it was officially issued because the household settled only periodically with a servant for all the sums owing him. This is illustrated by the two accounts, Farley's and Beverley's, which include debts.[9] For example, Beverley's account shows that Alan de Buxhull, a knight of the chamber, was supposed to receive 66s.8d. for his fees for Easter and 106s.8d. for his yearly robes; the Debentur, however, reveals that he was owed £8 13s.4d. at the end of the accounting period.

Liveries of robes are described as either summer or winter robes, and were, according to Edward II's household ordinances, made at Pentecost and Christmas.[10] However, Ypres' account contains the only entry in the accounts under discussion that states when a livery was made. William de Latimer, banneret, steward of the household, received 106s.8d. for his summer robes pro festo Pentecostes. In reality only persons entitled to robes valued at 40s. or more yearly received semi-annual installments. Servants whose robes were less than 40s. received their livery once a year at Christmas.[11]

The accounts indicate that there are eight different grades of yearly allowance ranging from £10 13s.4d. down to 6s.8d. Since Gunthorpe and Ypres record only summer robes, only persons entitled to robes valued at 40s. or more per year are listed in their accounts as receiving robe allowances.

The highest yearly robe allowance is the £10 13s.4d. (16 marks) granted, except in Gunthorpe's account, to the keeper of the household and bannerets. Gunthorpe reveals that the keeper and the steward only received 53s.4d. for their summer robes, half the second highest yearly robe allowance granted. Receiving 106s.8d. (8 marks) were knights and clerks of the highest grade, including the controller of the household (who was a layman in all but Farley's account), the cofferer (except in Farley's account where he received only 46s.8d.), and the keeper of the privy seal. Others granted robe allowances of this value were the king's almoner, chaplain, physician, and surgeon, and, in Ypres' account, the clerk of the queen's privy seal and her physician.

The third highest yearly robe allowance was valued at 46s.8d. The recipients include sergeants, sergeants-at-arms, clerks of the offices, chaplains and clerks of the chapel, clerks of the privy seal, and (from Ypres' account) clerks of the wardrobe of account (garderoba compoti). Several of the accounts indicate that persons issued a robe allowance of 46s.8d. yearly were granted 26s.8d. for winter robes and 20s. for summer robes. William de Dighton, clerk of the privy seal, appears in all five accounts. In Wakefield's and Beverley's he received yearly robes of 46s.8d.; in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' he received summer robes of 20s. Farley's account shows that Dighton received yearly robes for 1359-60 plus winter robes valued at 26s.8d. in 1360. Thus, for yearly robes valued at 46s.8d., the semi-annual liveries were not equal. For the other grades of servants granted summer and winter robes, the two issues were equal.

The fourth rank of household servants were those who received a yearly allowance of 40s. for their winter and summer robes. Men granted such an allowance include clerks of the third grade, esquires of the chamber and offices, minstrels (from Farley's account), and the queen's chaplains and the writing clerk of the queen's seal (from Ypres' account).

A robe allowance of 20s. was granted to the next lower rank of household servant. Most of the recipients are carters. The ranks or positions of the others are not given. However, they may have been clerks. For example, Farley's Feoda et Robe lists nine men for whom no rank is recorded. However, three of them are described as clerks in the Vadia Guerre. In Beverley's account no position is recorded for five men who received a 20s. robe allowance, but one of them, Thomas Penruddok, is called a clerk in the Calendar of Patent Rolls.[12]

Three ranks of servants received robes valued at less than 20s. However, in addition to their yearly robes, they were given a yearly footwear allowance of 4s.8d. Such allowances are described as winter and summer footwear, and were issued in equal portions.[13]

While Gunthorpe and Ypres record the issue of only yearly robe allowances valued at 40s. or more, the lists of household servants that can be made from them are almost as complete as those obtainable from the other three accounts because, except for outriders, these two accounts name the recipients of footwear allowances (that is, those receiving robe allowances of less than 20s. a year). The only persons not listed in Gunthorpe and Ypres are those entitled to robes valued at exactly 20s. per year. Even so, carters, who received yearly robe allowances of 20s., do appear in these two accounts because outriders received robes and footwear not by their own hands, but by the hands of the carter to whom they were attached.[14] Thus, it is the carters who are named, not the outriders. Aside from outriders, therefore, only those few persons (other than carters) receiving a yearly robe allowance of exactly 20s. are not named in Gunthorpe's or Ypres' Feoda et Robe.

Household servants receiving a yearly robe allowance of 13s.4d. include yeomen of the chamber and officers, and, in Farley's account, king's messengers. Receiving yearly robe allowances of 10s. were yeomen palfreymen, sumptermen, and maler'.[15] Finally, unnamed outriders received yearly robes of 6s.8d.

Excluding Gunthorpe's and Ypres' because they list only summer robe allowances, the accounts record the names of a number of men given only footwear. Farley indicates that 22 yeomen hunters received footwear only, but for two years (1359 to 1361). In the second year of Wakefield's account, for example, one entry shows that 18 men received allowances. The first 5 men received a yeoman's robe and footwear allowances, but the remainder only footwear. Since most of the 18 men appear in the Vadia Venatorum, they were all presumably hunters. Why most yeomen hunters received only footwear is not clear.[16]

Household servants did not normally receive robes or footwear if they were absent from court when liveries were made. A comparison of the details of wages paid hunters and falconers (as recorded in the Vadia Venatorum and the Vadia Falconariorum) with the names recorded in the Feoda et Robe reveals that those men absent most or all of the accounting period normally did not receive allowances of robes or footwear.[17] However, among the falconers there are a small number of exceptions. For example, the second year of Wakefield's account shows that Denis Fauconer, yeoman, was absent from court for the entire accounting period yet still received robes and footwear. Edmund Chesthunt, esquire, received wages out of court for the entire accounting period in Wakefield and Beverley, and also received robes. There is no indication why these particular individuals received robes and footwear. It is possible that in Chesthunt's case it was because he was Edward's chief falconer. Mary C. Hill[18] has shown that a senior messenger collected the robes and footwear for those of his companions who were absent from court when liveries were made. Perhaps a similar development was taking place among the upper echelon of falconers.

Although household personnel are listed according to rank, their specific tasks or the departments to which they were attached are rarely given, except in Ypres' and Farley's accounts. The only general exceptions are the steward, the treasurer, and the launderers and laundresses. Farley's account records the names of 2 physicians and 2 surgeons among the clerks there are 4 clerks of the privy seal and 7 clerks of the chapel. The esquires include Philip de la Gere, goldsmith, 8 falconers, and 14 minstrels. Also named are 13 messengers and 19 carters; ranking as yeomen are 16 falconers, 22 hunters, 8 farriers, 21 yeomen of the chamber, and 44 archers.

Ypres' account is quite detailed in assigning persons to specific tasks or departments. The controller was John de Ypres, the keeper of the privy seal Peter de Lacy, the chief chaplain of Edward's chapel John de Saxton, the almoner Robert de Whitbergh, the cofferer Richard de Beverley, the physician John de Glaston, and the surgeon Adam Leche. Three clerks of the offices are identified: Thomas de Bernolby was clerk of the pantry, buttery, and kitchen; William de Humberstane, Junior, was clerk of the spicery; and William de Humberstane, Senior, was clerk of the avenery. There are 2 clerks of the wardrobe of account, 2 clerks of the privy seal, and 7 chaplains and clerks of the king's chapel. Among the esquires are 5 falconers. The account names 49 yeomen of the chamber and offices, and also records the tasks of each or the department to which they were attached. There were 9 yeomen of the chamber, 7 of the kitchen, 4 of the buttery, 3 of the spicery and chandlery, 2 each of the wardrobe, pantry, larder, scullery, and saucery, and one each of the wardrobe of account, poultry, almonry, ewery, and the apothecary's office, in addition to 3 ushers of the hall, a partridge-catcher, a fisher, a ferreter, a "garbager" (Garbag'),[19] a doorman, a baker, a purveyor of grain, and a purveyor of the great kitchen. Other yeomen include 18 farriers, purveyors of oats and hay (one of whom, Robert Sadeler, is described as a "saddler"), 20 hunters, 8 falconers, and Thomas Irby, the purveyor of fruit. Finally, Margaret Knyghtle was the laundress of the napery.

While Farley, Wakefield, and Beverley record only the names of Edward's servants, Gunthorpe and Ypres also list the names of servants attached to a subsidiary household, that of the queen. Gunthorpe also indicates the presence of the attendants for Thomas and Joan, the lady of Brittany, while Ypres records those of Thomas, Joan, and the earl and countess of March. Gunthorpe provides the names of very few of the servants attached to important individuals living with the king, whereas Ypres, because of the careful listing of ranks and tasks, names 93 such servants, almost one-quarter of the staff listed in the titulus. Thus, Thomas had 3 esquires and 2 yeomen, and Joan one yeoman. A total of 82 persons are listed as Philippa's servants; one other, the seamstress Agatha Lyngeyn, was shared by both Edward and Philippa. The queen's servants include John de Hermesthorp, the clerk of her privy seal, Peter de Florence, her physician, and John Mils, the writing clerk of her seal. In addition, there were 6 clerks of her chapel and 12 esquires. Twenty-one yeomen were attached to the queen's household, and the positions of all but one are given. There were 10 yeomen of her chamber, 3 of her wardrobe, 2 of her buttery, and one each of her pantry, kitchen, and apothecary's office, in addition to a furrier and a waferer. One item lists the names of 39 yeomen palfreymen and sumptermen, of which one is identified as a carter, one as an outrider of a cart, one (Henry Aldresshate) as keeper of the queen's litter, and one (Richard atte Noke) as keeper of the queen's carts. Finally, there was Alice de Cestre, the laundress of Philippa's chamber, and Agatha Lyngeyn, the seamstress of the queen's chamber and the vestments of Edward's chapel.

The size of the household staff recorded in the Feoda et Robe of the accounts decreased from Farley's to Beverley's accounts. This is seen in the numbers of servants listed in each and in the expenditures on fees, robes, and footwear (see Table III). However, the large size of the household in Farley's account is misleading because that organization was on a war-time footing, including military personnel whose presence was only temporary. For example, Farley's account records the names of 10 bannerets, 48 knights (of whom 11 were newly created), 18 sergeants-at-arms, 44 yeomen archers, and 13 messengers. In the other accounts, only one or two bannerets, 5 or 6 knights and a similar number of sergeants-at-arms appear; no archers or messengers normally were household

TABLE III

SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD STAFF AND EXPENDITURE AS RECORDED IN THE FEODA ET ROBE

	Number of Servants* Named	Total Number Of Servants*	Expenditure
Farley	592	621	£1,293 10s.8d.
Gunthorpe	446	458	£ 289 8s.8d.
Ypres	387	399	£ 213 17s.
Wakefield (year 1)	356	372	£ 544 12d.
Wakefield (year 2)	356	377	£ 547 4s.
Beverley	338	352	£ 519 4d.

*These figures include the keeper of the privy seal and the clerks of the privy seal, who are identified only in Farley's and Ypres' accounts. Although the privy seal office was no longer attached to the household, its staff still received their robes from it. The higher figures in the second column represent the unnamed outriders in Farley's, Wakefield's, and Beverley's accounts, and, strictly speaking, the carters in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' (see above p. 168). To these can be added the named hunters and falconers who are not listed in the Feoda et Robe (see p. 217).

members. Other ranks of servants may also have been increased because of the war, but this is impossible to determine. If one excludes clearly identifiable war-time additions and their liveries (that is, all but about 3 bannerets, 6 knights, and 7 sergeants-at-arms, the approximate numbers of peacetime military personnel), the size of Farley's household was about 500. Thus the net decrease was about 150 persons over an 18 year period. However, the staff actually increased in size between the first and second years of Wakefield's account. Although these additions were not military personnel, the increase resulted from Edward's attempt to relieve La Rochelle.[20] The greatest decrease was between Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts where the staff was reduced by some 60 persons in less than three years. However, Ypres' accounting period covers a renewed outbreak of the Black Death, and the size of the staff was perhaps lower than it would have been under normal conditions.

It is impossible to determine the extent to which the incorporation of the queen's household[21] with that of the king increased the size of the king's staff. Ypres' account reveals that Edward's servants, including outriders, numbered 305, but the smallest staff to serve Edward when his household was not incumbered by that of his wife was some 350 in Beverley's account. This might suggest that some of Philippa's servants had been transferred from Edward's staff. The accounts show that, on her death, many of Philippa's staff joined Edward's.

The general decline in the size of the household staff is not as easily discernible from the total section expenditures (see Table III). The main difficulty is that Gunthorpe and Ypres contain incomplete issues, so that they cannot be compared with each other or with the other accounts.

Although Farley's Feoda et Robe includes wartime additions, an estimate of the size of the domestic household staff and of their liveries can be obtained by eliminating the obvious military staff and their issues. Doing so yields a staff of about 500 with an expenditure of some £775, or an approximate expenditure of £1.55 per person.[22] This compares favourably with the approximate £1.5 per capita expenditure found in the two years of Wakefield's and in Beverley's accounts, and suggests that the estimated size, or at least the composition, of Farley's domestic household staff is fairly accurate. The continuity of the per capita expenditures also suggests that the decreases were not made at the expense of any one level of servants, but were made over the entire household staff, with the exception of the chief officers of the household and its departments. This conclusion is generally borne out by a study of the various levels or grades of personnel listed in the accounts (see Table IV). However, Gunthorpe's account cannot be used because it seldom records ranks or positions.

The table shows that the numbers of bannerets did not essentially change, being limited, except in Farley's account,

TABLE IV

CHANGES IN NUMBERS OF VARIOUS GRADES OF NAMED PERSONNEL*

	Farley 1359-60	Ypres 1369	Wakefield 1371-72	Wakefield 1372-73	Beverley 1376-77
Bannerets	3	1	1	1	2
Knights	6	6	5	4	3
Clerks (1st grade)	8	8	6	6	7
Clerks of Offices	11	9	12	12	7
Clerks (1st grade)	13	14	11	10	15
Esquires and Falconers**	75 & 8	74 &*** 5	62 & 3	67	63 & 3
Sergeants	32	-***	17	17	21
Sergeants-at-arms	7	6	3	2	5
Yeomen of Chamber and Offices#	21 & 95	19 & 82	92	90	94

TABLE IV (Continued)

	Farley 1359-60	Ypres 1369	Wakefield 1371-72	Wakefield 1372-73	Beverley 1376-77
Carters	19	12	17	20	14
Yeomen Sumpter- & Palfreymen[##]	31 & 111	140	90	85	73
Yeomen hunters	22	20	18	18	18

[*] Gunthorpe's account is not used because it seldom records ranks or positions. The table does not include the keeper of the wardrobe, launderers, laundresses, or those whose position is neither given nor determinable. In Farley's account, the numbers of bannerets, knights, and sergeants-at-arms are estimates, while the yeomen of the offices exclude archers and messengers.

[**] The figures represent esquires and esquire falconers respectively. They were not kept separate in Wakefield (year 2).

[***] Except for the falconers, esquires and sergeants were combined.

[#] The two sets of figures for Farley and Ypres represent yeomen of the chamber and yeomen of the offices respectively.

[##] The two figures for Farley represent yeomen sumptermen and yeomen palfreymen respectively.

to the steward and, in Beverley's account, to the chamberlain. On the other hand, the number of knights of the chamber did decrease slightly. Including the keeper, the total number of clerks in the household declined slightly, from 25 in Farley's account to 23 in Beverley's. Between Farley's and Wakefield's accounts, the numbers of esquires, sergeants of the offices, and sergeants-at-arms decreased, although it is impossible to determine how many, if any, of the sergeants in Farley's account were military additions. The numbers of esquires remained fairly steady between Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts, but in the same interval the sergeants and the sergeants-at-arms increased. It is not clear why the numbers of sergeants-at-arms increased, but the increase in the numbers of sergeants may have resulted from the corresponding decrease in the numbers of clerks of the offices. Except for a small increase between Wakefield and Beverley, the yeomen of the chamber and offices decreased. The numbers of yeomen palfreymen and sumptermen declined during the entire period, probably reflecting Edward's increasingly sedentary life. Yeomen hunters decreased by 4 between Farley and Wakefield, but remained the same for Wakefield and Beverley. Presumably, the decreased size of the household meant that less meat was required.

The final household members are the carters. These figures are more difficult to interpret. The numbers of carters in Ypres' and Beverley's accounts are similar and probably represent normal conditions. The higher numbers in Wakefield's account are undoubtedly due to the household's role in Edward's war preparations. Military activities probably also explain the higher numbers in Farley's account. That Ypres and Beverley record the normal numbers of carters is supported by Gunthorpe's account, which shows that 12 carters received footwear allowances for their outriders. The liveries issued two men are also pertinent. Thomas Lovekyn received robe and footwear allowances as a yeoman of the chamber or offices during the first year of Wakefield's account; in the second year he received robes and footwear allowances for an outrider. However, in Beverley's account Lovekyn once again received allowances as a yeoman. Richard atte Noke received liveries as a carter in the second year of Wakefield's account, but in Beverley's he received them as a yeoman of the chamber or offices. It appears, therefore, that some of the carters in the second year of Wakefield's account were temporary appointments.

A comparison of the individuals named in the Feoda et Robe of each account indicates a certain continuity among the household staff, assuming, of course, that those persons who appear in more than one account continued to serve in the household during the intervening periods. Of the 446 persons named in Gunthorpe's account, 119 (27%) also appear in Farley's account. Thus, in the six years between the two accounts, not only did the size of the household staff decrease greatly, but there was also a considerable change in personnel. The time periods between the other accounts were not as great and so there was more continuity. Ypres' account records the names of 387 persons, of which 281 (72%) also occur in Gunthorpe's account. Of the 356 persons named in both years of Wakefield's account, 342 (96%) are common to both, while 286 (75%) are found in Ypres' account. Finally, 256 (75%) of the 338 persons named in Beverley's account also are named in Wakefield's.

Not only is there continuity of household personnel from one account to the next, but a large number appear in three successive accounts. This is particularly true of the last four accounts under discussion. Fewer persons appear in four of the five accounts. Thus, 63 persons are common to the first four accounts (Farley, Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield); 147 persons are common to the last four accounts (Gunthorpe, Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley). The fact that about 33% of the household personnel in Gunthorpe's account was still active 10 years later suggests a fairly stable household staff. In all, 55 men (about 10% of Farley's staff) were active during the entire 18 years spanned by the accounts. Of these, 46 men appear in all five accounts; another 9 men occur in both Farley's and Beverley's accounts but not in one of the intervening ones. These nine men were probably household servants the entire period but were absent when liveries were made during one accounting period. Although not necessarily representative of the other household servants, these

55 men will be used to illustrate the advancement of the household staff. The discussion must be somewhat imprecise because, with the general exception of Ypres' account, the exact functions of the household members are seldom given. Only the advancement from one rank to another can be seen from the accounts.

Of the 55 men mentioned above, only 10 men, who appear in all the accounts, actually advanced from one rank to another. Five yeomen became esquires. For example, Henry de Almann is a yeoman of the chamber in Farley's and Ypres' accounts, but is described as an esquire in Wakefield's and Beverley's. Edmund Chesthunt, a yeoman falconer in Farley's account, received the summer robes of an esquire in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts; in Wakefield's and Beverley's he is included among the esquire falconers. Two yeomen became sergeants. Simon de Bukenham is a yeoman of the offices in Farley's account; he received summer robes as either an esquire or sergeant in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts; in Wakefield's and Beverley's he is called a sergeant of the household. John Pusy is a yeoman of the chamber or offices in Farley's and Wakefield's accounts, a yeoman of the chandlery and spicery in Ypres', and a sergeant of the household in Beverley's. Two sergeants became esquires. Robert de Louth is called a sergeant of the offices in Farley's account, but in Ypres' he is a queen's esquire, and an esquire in Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts. John Herlyng is a sergeant in Farley's account, ranked as a sergeant or esquire in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts, but is called an esquire in Wakefield's and Beverley's. Finally, John de Saxton is a clerk of the king's chapel in Farley's account and received summer robes as such in Gunthorpe's, but is called chief chaplain of the king's chapel in Ypres' account, receiving robes at that level in the final two accounts.

Examples of promotion also occur among men who were not household servants the entire period covered by the accounts. Richard Pekker is a carter in Ypres' and the first year of Wakefield's accounts, but a yeoman of the chamber or offices in the second year of Wakefield's and Beverley's. In Ypres' and Wakefield's accounts John Boys is a yeoman palfreyman or sumpterman, but in Beverley's he is a yeoman of the chamber or offices. Helming Leget, an esquire in Gunthorpe's, Ypres's, and Wakefield's accounts, is called a sergeant (he was clerk of the market) in Beverley's. John de Ypres was controller of the household in Ypres' and Wakefield's accounts, but steward of the household in Beverley's. Richard de Beverley received the robes of a clerk of the first grade in Gunthorpe's account; he was cofferer of the household in Ypres' and Wakefield's, and treasurer in Beverley's. A final example is Richard Stury, an esquire in Farley's account, who is called knight of the chamber in Wakefield's and Beverley's accounts. However, Stury does not appear in either Gunthorpe or Ypres.

Among the 45 men who were household servants during the entire period and who did not advance in rank were 9 yeomen palfreymen and sumptermen, 7 yeomen of the chamber or offices, 6 yeomen hunters, 3 carters, 7 esquires, 4 sergeants, 2 sergeants-at-arms, and 5 clerks. Of the clerks, Farley and Ypres describe two as being of the privy seal and the other three as being of the king's chapel. Their positions are not given in the other accounts. Finally, Peter de Breux, knight of the chamber, and John de Glaston, the king's physician, appear in all the accounts. In general, it appears that promotion from one household rank to another was not particularly common.

The Feoda et Robe section records the names of those household servants entitled to fees, robes, or footwear. Robes and footwear, or money payments in lieu thereof, were normally issued only to those household servants actually in court when the liveries were made. The value of such liveries depended upon the rank of the recipient. Those household members receiving yearly robes valued at 40s. or more received winter and summer liveries; those persons whose yearly robe allowances were less than 40s. received only a winter livery. Footwear was issued twice yearly only to those persons whose yearly robes were valued at less than 20s. Fees were issued for two reasons. Knights and bannerets attached to the household, in keeping with their rank, received yearly fees, not wages. Some servants received yearly fees because of their offices.

The launderers and laundresses were issued money for wood and ashes and the seamstresses money for thread.

Excluding the temporary military additions in Farley's account, the size of the household decreased from some 500 in Farley's account to some 350 in Beverley's. The most significant decline was between Farley's and Ypres' accounts; the numbers declined only slightly from Wakefield's two accounts to Beverley's. The decline in the total number of household servants is generally reflected over the entire range of household personnel, except that the number of clerks was practically constant during the entire period. A declining household reflects Edward's increasingly retired way of life, as well as a household restricted more and more to mere domestic tasks. Edward's military endeavours in the second year of Wakefield's account resulted in a minimal increase, but these appear to be mostly carters, not military personnel.

A certain continuity of the household staff is visible in the persons named in the Feoda et Robe of the accounts. A total of 55 men (some 10% of Farley's staff) were active in all the accounts, a period of 18 years; 147 men (about 33% of Gunthorpe's staff) were active in the last four accounts, a period of 10 years. The examples provided by the 55 men active in all the accounts would suggest that the opportunity for promotion among the household staff was minimal. Only 10 men actually advanced from one rank to another.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IX

[1] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 238.

[2] Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward I", p. 68.

[3] Tout, *Chapters*, II, pp. 28-29, and Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 229-30.

[4] See pp. 85-86 and Chapter XII, especially pp. 216, 218-220.

[5] A banneret was, originally, a knight who could lead vassals in the field of battle under his own banner. He ranked below a baron but above other knights. Table V, p. 231, shows that the war wages of a banneret were less than those of a baron but higher than those of a knight. The *Vadia Guerre* (War Wages) shows that bannerets were both the members of the retinues of barons and the leaders of their own retinues (see p. 228). Later, the title "banneret" came to be merely an order or rank of knighthood.

[6] The fees were granted for the following periods: Farley - Easter and Michaelmas, 1360; Gunthorpe - Easter and Michaelmas, 1366; Ypres - Easter 1369; Wakefield (year 1) - Michaelmas 1371, Easter 1372; Wakefield (year 2) - Michaelmas 1372, Easter 1373; and Beverley - Easter 1377.

[7] See below, pp. 172, 174, 175.

[8] The laundresses and seamstresses are the only women named in the *Feoda et Robe* of the accounts. No women appear in Farley's or the first year of Wakefield's accounts; there are 5 women in Gunthorpe's, 3 in Ypres', and one in each of the second year of Wakefield's and Beverley's.

[9] See pp. 58-59, 66-67.

[10] Tout, "Household Ordinances", *Edward II*, pp. 271 ff., and Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward II", p. 96. The robe issues covered by the accounts are as follows: Farley - winter 1359, summer 1360; Gunthorpe - summer 1366; Ypres - summer 1369; Wakefield (year 1) - winter 1371, summer 1372; Wakefield (year 2) - winter 1372, summer 1373; and Beverley - winter 1376,

summer 1377. No reason is given why Gunthorpe records only summer robes, even though the account covers a full year.

[11] Tout, "Household Ordinances", Edward II, pp. 270-318. See also Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 238-39.

[12] C.P.R., 1374-1377, p. 258.

[13] Footwear allowances were presumably issued at the same time as robe allowances were made. Only summer allowances occur in Ypres' account, whereas the other accounts record yearly issues, despite the fact that Gunthorpe records the granting of summer robes only. The years for footwear issues correspond to robe issues except for Gunthorpe's account, which was summer and winter 1366 (see n. 9 above).

[14] Tout, "Household Ordinances", Edward II, p. 301.

[15] A maler is a type of horse (see p. 152), so the reference is to a servant who had something to do with one or more of them.

[16] However, Farley's account, which includes the expenses of the great wardrobe, shows that many esquire and yeomen falconers, porters of falcons, yeomen hunters, and grooms of hunters were issued gifts of robes by the keeper of the great wardrobe (see pp. 199-200).

[17] See p. 217.

[18] The King's Messengers, 1199-1377 - A Contribution to the History of the Royal Household (London, Edward Arnold, 1961), pp. 24, 54-55.

[19] See p. 84.

[20] See pp. 178-79.

[21] See p. 75.

[22] See above, pp. 172, 174. The elimination of only the 3 bannerets and 29 knights who did not receive fees (see p. 163), as well as the messengers and archers, yields an expense of some £1,060 on 530 persons, or an expenditure of £2.0 per person. Including all the personnel in the Feoda et Robe, the per capita expense is about £2.1.

CHAPTER X

DONA

The Dona (Gifts) record the value of gifts, or rewards, granted by Edward and, in Gunthorpe's account, by Edward and Philippa.[1] Most of the gifts, or rewards, are not gifts in the ordinary sense, but are payments for services rendered or for articles "presented" to the king or queen, usually birds, fish, or game. There are some true gifts listed, such as wine, clothing, and bedroom hangings, but personal gifts of great value, which the king must have given, are not found under this heading. Presumably such important gifts were recorded in the chamber accounts. The disbursements could be made in money or in goods and commodities. In all but Farley's account, gifts of wine constitute a considerable portion of the Dona expenses. Occasionally the recipients of the gifts were household servants, but this was unusual.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's Dona contain expenses which in the three later accounts were entered in different tituli. Farley records expenditures dealing with messengers; these will be discussed in Chapter XI. Expenses pertaining to horses, which appear in both Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts, were considered in Chapter VIII.

The discussion of what might be termed normal Dona expenses will be based primarily upon the accounts of Farley and Gunthorpe. These have the most extensive Dona expenses and provide examples of most of the disbursements recorded in the others. The three remaining accounts have little to add: the Dona expenses of Ypres and Beverley are few and deal mostly with gifts of wine. Most of the gifts recorded in Farley's account are related either to the war in France or to the peace negotiations at Calais. The entries in the last four accounts are concerned primarily with the domestic expenses of the royal household. An unusual feature of Farley's Dona is that many entries are undated, although from time to time dated entries are to be found. Perhaps it was not known when the undated gifts were granted, except that they were made in a period between dated entries.

Gifts in Farley's account which pertain to the war can be divided into several categories. One of these is the payments "in subsidy" (in subsidium) of money to ransom members of the English forces captured by the French. It is not specified whether the king paid all, or only part, of an individual's ransom. Almost £200 was granted for the ransoms of 29 men; the individual sums paid range from £50 for the ransom of Richard Stury, esquire, to 52s. for both John Horwode and Thomas de Chestre, grooms. Those benefitting from this sort of gift include not only household servants found in the Feoda et Robe, such as Stury, but also others, such as Richard Barton and William de Pulleteria, described as purveyors of the office of the poultry, who were not granted robes or footwear. Presumably the latter two were prisoners when liveries were officially issued. Others receiving gifts towards their ransoms include John Smert, a master smith, and the poet Geoffrey Chaucer.

One entry states that Edward paid the ransom of a captured Frenchman. Oweyn de Charleton,[2] esquire, was granted 40s. for a French smith. The king presumably received the custody of the smith; perhaps Edward required the smith's skilled services.

Another category of war expenses found in Farley's account consists of gifts of money made to individuals who had been given royal permission to leave the king's service. Most of the recipients appear to have been soldiers from the empire, although this is stated only of Alsiz van Holtwiz, described as an "esquire of Germany". He received 40s. The margrave of Meissen was granted £120 "in subsidy" for his expenses when given Edward's leave to depart for his home. A total of £1,280 was granted in this manner to 63 men, who received sums ranging from 33s.4d. to £123 6s.8d. Two recipients who were not soldiers were the brothers Galeys and Caminus, minstrels of Roger Mortimer, earl of March. The brothers were granted 66s.8d. on 29 February 1360, the day on which the earl died.[3] Presumably the services of the two minstrels were not required by anyone, and the king was assisting them to return home.

Nearly £90 was granted in other gifts dealing with the war or the peace negotiations. For example, William Maynard and William Burdon, king's painters, were granted £4 on 3

November 1359 for their expenses in going to France. Between 30 November and 13 December 1360 the lords Walter de Manny and Roger de Beauchamp each received £4 for their expenses between Calais and England. Between 1 and 3 March 1360 a gift of £4 was granted to John de Massyngham and the yeomen carpenters under him for repairing the bridge of Brienon l'Archêveque. In an undated entry, John Gardiner, groom of the door-keeper, was granted 30s.8d. for his expenses in staying in the Tower of London and at Calais guarding the king of France. Finally, Edward made gifts to two mariners ships were wrecked in the vicinity of Calais. John Cokirsand received £6 13s.4d. between 3 and 6 November 1359; Nicholas Gudde received £10 between 6 November 1359 and 12 January 1360. Presumably the boats of Cokirsand and Gudde had been commandeered to carry troops and supplies to France.

Although the period of Wakefield's account witnessed Edward's attempt to relieve the siege of La Rochelle, few military expenditures appear in his Dona. The first year of the account shows that Andrew Elyot, master of the ship le Margerie Legat, and three sailor friends received 40s. on 3 April 1372 for piloting the king's large ship, the Grace Dieu, from Orwell to the Thames. Gifts of victuals presumably destined for the war effort are found in the second year of the account. Simon de Bukenham, the keeper of the king's victuals across the sea, delivered to prince Edward, lord Edward le Despenser, and William de Montendre, knight, wine, flour, cider, salted oxen, mutton, and fish valued at almost £60. These victuals were granted at Sandwich on 26 August 1372, the day before the king boarded ship for his abortive expedition.

One entry in the Dona of Wakefield's first year refers to expenses incurred almost a year prior to the accounting period. A privy seal writ dated at Clarendon on 20 July 1370 ordered payment of £47 16s.8d. in wages to 38 men-at-arms and 90 archers for staying in certain ships at Southampton and for guarding Charles the Bad, king of Navarre, "across the sea" (supra mare).[4] The king of Navarre had been negotiating with England in June of 1370.

Farley's account states that lord William de Burton was sent to the papal curia on Edward's business and received £8 for his expenses at some time between 8 April and 15 May 1360. This sum was additional to the £93 6s.8d. he received in the Necessaria[5] for his daily expenses when out of court on this mission between 14 March and 31 July 1360.

All the accounts contain rewards to persons helping Edward and his familia in their travels. In Farley's, gifts were granted to those who guided Edward and the army in France. In the other accounts, they were normally gifts to ferry-men for transporting Edward and his retinue across rivers in England.

Farley's account records gifts totalling some £87 to persons acting as guides. For example, lord Robert de Vipount, lord Mapinus Marell, and Peter de Morance received the large sum of £74 13s.4d. for guiding the king from Le Neubourg to Thibouville. The entry is undated, but appears between ones dated 22 and 23 June 1360. These dates apparently indicate when the payment was made, and not when the expense was incurred, since Edward was in England at this time and had been in Thibouville on 12 and 13 May.[6] An undated entry shows that Richard de Thibouville, a French yeoman, received a gift of £7 by the hands of lord Roger de Beauchamp for leading the king's army from Thibouville to Dounpere.

In the last four accounts, Edward seems to have been most active in his travels in Gunthorpe's. Gifts to ferry-men are numerous in his account, and were granted by both Edward and Philippa. For example, John Feryman of Milton received 13s.4d. for conveying the king and his familia across the Medway at Milton. Adam Wose and his companions received a similar gift for conveying the queen and her familia across the Thames at Sheen. Similar items referring to the king occur in Ypres', Wakefield's, and Beverley's accounts. Ypres' account contains an interesting, but perplexing, item. William Lorchon was granted 10s. on 16 February 1369 for conveying in his own boat the king and his familia and their equipment between the bridges at Westminster (inter pontes apud Westm'). Lorchon's services were employed for 10 days. No reason for these travels is given, although the return of the Black Death may have made conveyance by water safer, when in or near London and Westminster. Ferry boat operators at times received more than gifts of money. The grants of wine in Gunthorpe's accounts include a gift of 1 pipe of Rhenish wine valued at £11 13s.4d. to the Thames ferry-men at Sheen.

Gunthorpe's account has other entries dealing with travel. For example, Walter Norman and 15 companions received 66s.8d. for conveying the queen by water to Havering. Another entry reveals that John Hatton, William Cok, and William Prest, servants of Peter de Lacy, rector of the church of Northfleet, were granted 20s. for going with the queen between Gravesend and Sheppey with three horses belonging to de Lacy. Household servants occasionally were rewarded for their labours during moves. For example, Gunthorpe reveals that Robert de Certesey, a page in the office of the saucery, received 20s. for his work during various moves.

The first year of Wakefield's account records payments for damages caused in these moves. John, the bailiff of the rector of Everley, was paid 13s.4d. in recompense for his injury at the hour of the king's dinner. Although unspecified, the injury appears to have been physical in nature. Robert But of Harwich was granted 20s. in recompense for his expenses and for damages caused by the king's familia. Presumably, this damage was to his house or animals.

Some of Edward's travels were undoubtedly concerned with hunting, an interest reflected in Gunthorpe's Dona. For example, John Martyn of Sheppey received a gift of 20s. for his labours in taking or capturing (captio) birds when Edward was in the vicinity of Sheppey. John de Morton returned to Edward a lost falcon and received a gift of 6s.8d.

Edward's hunting dogs were responsible for several expenses. The first year of Wakefield's account shows that John Toret and Robert Hauden were rewarded with a sum of 15s.4d. for staying out of court with the king's dogs for 118 days. Gunthorpe's account records compensation paid the owners of animals killed by Edward's greyhounds. Henry Clerc received a gift of 26s.4d. for 10 sheep, each valued at 20d., and 29 lambs, each valued at 4d., which had been killed by the greyhounds in the custody of William Kydwyt. Thomas Prest and 7 others received 42s.8d. in recompense for the 30 sheep and 1 cow killed by Edward's greyhounds.

Both Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts reveal that Edward granted gifts of money to servants who had fallen ill. In Farley's account, for example, Andrew Messager was granted 12s. because he had fallen ill at London. Gunthorpe shows that John Wade fell ill at Clarendon and was left behind when Edward departed on a hunting trip. Wade received 6s.8d. for his expenses.

Despite the numerous references in the accounts to minstrels, there are few gifts for musical performances. Gifts to minstrels are found in only Farley's, Ypres', and Wakefield's accounts. Farley has only one such gift; it shows that various minstrels received 16s.8d. for entertaining the king. Ypres' and Wakefield's accounts record gifts to musicians for performances connected with Edward's pilgrimages to Canterbury. Both years of Wakefield's account state that minstrels were granted 13s.4d. for making their music before the image of the Blessed Mary in the vault of Canterbury Cathedral and before the shrine of St. Augustine in the Church of St. Augustine.[7] In Ypres' account, Hanekinus Fytheler was granted 6s.8d. for performing before the image of the Blessed Mary in the vault of Canterbury Cathedral.

Edward was often presented with gifts, either on the giver's or someone else's behalf, and his gratitude was shown by a gift of money to the person bringing the gift. Expenses of this sort occur in Farley's, Gunthorpe's, and Wakefield's accounts, but those in Gunthorpe's are the most numerous. The latter account shows that Edward and Philippa respectively granted 37 and 15 gifts of this nature. In nearly a third of the items Edward granted 6s.8d., while all but four of Philippa'a gifts were of the same value. The sum 6s.8d. is described as both Edward's and Philippa's "accustomed fees" (_feodi sui consueti_).[8]

Most of the gifts presented to Edward in Gunthorpe's account consisted of victuals, generally birds or fish. The birds brought as gifts include snipe, plovers, larks, fieldfares, swans, partridges, teals, and capons. For example, John Hatter of Bedfont received 4s. for presenting Edward with 28 snipe, 2 plovers, 23 larks, and 12 fieldfares; Hanekinus Foulere presented 2 swans to the king and received

13s.4d. The types of fish given include salmon, lampreys, flounders, loaches, sturgeon, chubs, pickerel, perches, and roaches. Most of these fish were fresh. For example, John de Grenewych was granted 66s.8d. when he presented the king with a fresh sturgeon. John de Compton presented Edward with three live lampreys on 29 December 1366 at Windsor and received £4. Two days later John Kyng, yeoman of the lord of Berkley and on his behalf, also made a gift of three live lampreys. Kyng received only 6s.8d. Presumably the gifts to Grenewych, Compton, and Kyng were tips. The gift to Compton was far more than payment for the lampreys while sturgeon were royal fish, the king's prerogative,[9] and so there would be no payment. Why Grenewych and Compton should be given such large gifts, and Kyng such a comparatively small one, is not explained, but presumably the king was in a particularly good mood when Grenewych and Compton brought their fish. Some men offered gifts regularly. On 10 occasions between 27 March and 3 December 1366, Henry Fyssher presented Edward with fish and received a total of £3 10s. in gifts.

Other gifts of victuals presented to Edward in the various accounts include porpoise, crabs, and crayfish, cheese, wine, and fruit, such as pears and pomegranates. Wakefield provides most of these examples. The first year of his account shows that John Ropere received 6s.8d. when he presented crabs, porpoise, and fish to Edward on behalf of John Wynterbourne. John Demond was granted 20s. when he presented the king with

27 cheeses of Brie and 400 breams and crayfish. The butler and hunter of the duke of Guelders presented Edward with 13 cuu' of Rhenish wine on their lord's behalf, and were rewarded with a sum of £22 6s.8d. This sum was granted by a privy seal writ given at Clarendon on 26 July 1370, which precedes by almost a year the actual accounting period. This entry also appears in the Prestita[10] where it is crossed out. The value of this gift suggests both payment for the wine and gifts to the bearers. The second year of Wakefield's account reveals that John Wode received 20s. for presenting Edward with 50 pomegranates.

Edward was also presented with animals. Thus, Gunthorpe's account states that Walter de Leek, yeoman of John de Leek, presented Edward with a bay palfrey on his lord's behalf, while John de Halseham presented the king with two greyhounds on behalf of Richard de Ravensere. Both Walter de Leek and Halseham were granted 6s.8d. In Farley's account an unnamed yeoman from France received 36s. when he presented Edward with one falcon on behalf of his unnamed lord.

Nearly all of the gifts presented to the queen were of victuals. Most of the presents were given to the queen on the king's behalf.[11] Philippa received a total of 15 fattened bucks (dami ping') from Edward. For example, Thomas Hyde, packman of the buttery, presented the queen with two fattened bucks, on behalf of the king, and received a reward of 6s.8d. John Barnet, bishop of Bath and Wells, treasurer of

England, presented the queen with six pike by the hands of his esquire, Henry de Haggeleye. Haggeleye received a gift of 20s. from the queen; Thomas Cook and William Fysshere together received 13s.4d. for carrying the pike from Dogmersfield to Windsor. She also received a porpoise, a barbel, a sturgeon, and a cheese of Brie from Edward, and herons and partridges from other persons. In addition to these victuals, Philippa was the recipient of 3 horses. For example, she received as mentioned previously, a white courser called "Blanchard Kyng" from Edward.[12] Richard Ottemore, who brought the horse to Philippa, was rewarded by her with the sum of 5s.

Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts record gifts without explanation or merely state that they were made for the recipient's expenses. Some expenses in Farley's account were incurred in partibus Francie. For example, Robert Sadeler, yeomen, saddler of the household, received 24s. in payment of his expenses in France. William atte Mulle, Edward's master sapper, received 33s.4d. for his expenses. Not only did Edward's servants receive such gifts, but so did servants of the queen, of Edmund of Langley, and of the king of France. Several men, such as Nicholas de Shoufeld and Siboetus van Ruere, received gifts when granted Edward's permission to leave his service and gifts for expenses. By far the largest unexplained gift is the sum granted lord Eustace de Dabrichecourt. In an undated entry added at the end of the Dona, he is shown to have received £320.

Gunthorpe's account also records gifts with little or no explanation. For example, on 1 July 1366 Edmund Sauvage and two companions, tellers of the lower exchequer, received 20s., while Richard de Grafton and his companions, ushers of the lower exchequer, received 6s.8d. One interesting item says that William de Risceby received 10s. at Corfe for paying money to a certain man in Newgate prison.

An important part of the Dona is gifts in kind, such as wine, clothing, and victuals, granted by Edward to various persons. Gifts of wine appear in all the accounts; gifts of clothing appear in only Farley's, and gifts of victuals only in the second year of Wakefield's. The gifts of victuals are mentioned above.[13] Gifts of clothing, mercery, and other things, totalling almost £520, appear in Farley's account because the keeper of the great wardrobe at this time accounted to the keeper of the wardrobe.[14]

John de Newbury, clerk of the great wardrobe, delivered to the queen fur valued at almost £10 and wax and spices valued at nearly £145. Lords Edmund of Langley and John de Montfort, the duke of Brittany, and Joan, the lady of Brittany, were granted gifts of cloth, mercery, fur, and "other things" totalling some £124. Finally, a very lengthy entry records gifts of robes and "other things" to various persons. Unnamed household servants, many of them hunters, falconers, and grooms, servants of the lady of Brittany, and Master Thomas Powiz and 32 scholars of the king at Cambridge received either summer or winter robes. Lord Denis de Morbek, knight, received a tunic, hood, cloak, and stockings. Two clerks of Cambridge received complete bed-hangings; brother John Wodrove, Edward's confessor, and his companion received complete habits. John de Elmeswell, yeoman of the great wardrobe, received sacks, bags, bales, and coverings for cloths. These gifts amounted to some £242.

Gifts of wine are by far the most important gifts in kind which Edward granted.[16] In all but Farley's Dona, such gifts account for a major proportion (nearly all in Ypres' and Beverley's accounts) of the total value of gifts granted. Presents of this sort normally consisted of Gascon wine, although gifts of Rhenish wine, Malmsey, and wine of Beaune also occur.

Members of Edward's family figure prominently among the recipients of wine. For example, in Farley's account Philippa received 21 casks of Gascon wine valued at £122 21d., 3 pipes of Rhenish wine valued at £28 14s.6d., and 4 pipes of Malmsey valued at £42 17s.4d. The second year of Wakefield's account shows that Edward, prince of Wales, received 2 casks 1 pipe of Gascon wine and 1 pipe of Rhenish wine. The king's friends and servants also received gifts of wine. Important nobles, such as Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Northampton, Edmund de Mortimer, earl of March, Robert de Ufford, earl of Suffolk, and William de Montague, earl of Salisbury, were each granted 2 casks of Gascon wine in Farley's account. Alice Perrers, Edward's celebrated mistress, Robert Thorp, chief justice of the king's bench, and brother John Wodrove received wine in various accounts. Adam Leche, Edward's surgeon, was also granted wine. An entry in the second year of Wakefield's account reveals that Leche was given 6 sesters 1 pitcher of Gascon wine, valued at some 20s., which was used to make medicines. In Gunthorpe's account, the clerk of the royal works in the manor of Sheen and the constables and minor officials of Sheppey Castle were granted wine.

Wakefield and Beverley show that wine was granted to the king's council at Westminster. For example, Beverley states that the council consumed 3 casks of Gascon wine which had been stored in the secret cellar at Westminster. However, the expense was disallowed at the exchequer audit because the warrant for the gift was defective. Both years of Wakefield's account record gifts of wine for anniversary masses for queen mother Isabella and queen Philippa. A number of religious establishments were granted wine. Recipients include the abbots of Chertsey, Stratford, and Beaulieu, the prioress of Minster on the Isle of Sheppey, the vicar of the college of Windsor, and the cantor of the collegiate church of Blessed Mary in Southampton.

Certain persons received life-time grants of wine. These took the form of either yearly or daily issues. For example, the first year of Wakefield's account indicates that

Alice Perrers received 2 casks of Gason wine per year. Beverley shows that the poet Geoffrey Chaucer received a lifetime grant of one gallon of Gascon wine per day. The total wine given Chaucer for the period 14 October 1376 to 21 June 1377 was 1 cask 10 sesters 1 pitcher, valued at £7 2s.6 1/2d. However, the gift was disallowed at the exchequer audit because the warrant was defective, and the gift partly preceded the accounting period.

The Dona includes not only gifts or rewards proper, but also grants of money which appear to be payments for service rendered or for presents brought to the king. Edward rewarded those who performed services for him, such as ferryboat operators who transported him and his familia across rivers, or those who brought him gifts. Persons staying out of court on Edward's business were granted gifts to pay their expenses. Gifts in the last four accounts under discussion generally are of a domestic nature, while many in Farley's are of a military nature, such as those for the payment of ransoms or of expenses of foreign soldiers who departed from Edward's army. With the exception of Farley's account, wines are the most important gifts that Edward granted. Farley's Dona contains gifts, such as payments of the expenses of messengers and the replacement of horses lost, which were entered in their own tituli in later accounts, as well as gifts of fur, cloth, and wax issued by the keeper of the great wardrobe, who temporarily accounted to the keeper of the wardrobe.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER X

[1] The total expenses are: Farley - £3,259 17s.8 3/4d.; Gunthorpe - £493 4s.1d.; Ypres - £129 3s.6d.; Wakefield (year 1) - £426 13s.11 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £527 12 1/d.; and Beverley - £59 18s.4d. In Beverley's account, a number of gifts of wine were disallowed (see below, n. 16).

[2] See p. 234.

[3] See p. 119 n. 21.

[4] See also p. 254.

[5] See p. 130.

[6] Fowler, *King's Lieutenant*, p. 211.

[7] See pp. 100-101. Eleanor, Edward's sister, gave gifts to minstrels for performing before the image of Blessed Mary in Canterbury Cathedral, as well as to those who performed before the cross at the northern door of St. Paul's Cathedral in London (E. W. Safford, "An Account of the Expenses of Eleanor, Sister of Edward III, on the Occasion of Her Marriage to Reynald, count of Guelders", *Archaeologia*, vol. LXXVII (1927), pp. 132, 133).

[8] However, another item also describes 5s. as Philippa's "accustomed fee" but this sum occurs only once. Gunthorpe's is the only account to mention an "accustomed fee".

[9] See Cyrus H. Karraker, "Royal Fish", *Quarterly Review*, vol. *CCLXVII* (1936), pp. 129-37.

[10] See p. 254.

[11] The king's gifts discussed here are in addition to presents of wine, fur, etc. mentioned below, pp. 199, 200.

[12] See p. 158.

[13] See pp. 190-91.

[14] See pp. 138-41.

[15] See pp. 168-69, 186 n. 16.

[16] The totals are: Farley - £484 9s.4d.; Gunthorpe - £426 17s. 11d.; Ypres - £126 17s.; Wakefield (year 1) - £347 18s.7 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £451 5s.9d.; and Beverley - £59 11s.8d. In addition, Beverley records gifts of wine valued at £87 15s. 1/2d. which were disallowed either because there was no warrant, the warrant was defective, or the gift preceded the accounting period. The value of these disallowed gifts was charged as prests against the butler (see pp. 253-54).

CHAPTER XI

NUNCII

The titulus Nuncii (Messengers) found in all the accounts records money spent on sending or receiving messengers or letters.[1] Men could be sent from the household with letters, to seek or fetch someone (querendus), or "on the king's secret business", an impressive phrase which probably meant little more than a matter that personally concerned the king. Most letters were sent by the king, but in Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts, they might be sent by the queen. In addition to unspecified types of letter, letters of the secret seal (de secreto sigillo)[2] and letters of the privy seal are mentioned.

In all but Farley's account, men sent with letters or messages from the household usually seem to have been any available household servants; none are described as nuncii in the accounts. While the household staff does not normally appear to have included professional messengers, Farley's account frequently mentions the king's messengers (nuncii Regis), who were the official letter carriers of the administration and who had come subject to exchequer control in 1342.[3] The employment of such professionals during Farley's period of account probably stems from the war in France and the household's responsibilities for expenditures made in France.

Farley's account lists expenses for messengers not only in the Nuncii but also in the Necessaria and the Dona. Those individuals recorded in the Necessaria[4] were men of rank, and two of them received expense allowances of 6s.8d. per day, whereas the ordinary messenger, if he received an allowance, never was given more than 6d. per day. The men listed in the Necessaria appear to have discharged tasks greater than the simple delivery of messages and, therefore, could not have been classed as nuncii.

Farley's Dona records gifts to persons carrying messages or letters. Why such items occur in the Dona is not clear. Between 31 January and 3 February 1360, Michael Henner received a gift of £4 in going from the king in France to the queen in England. Robert le Fevere received a gift of 2s.9d. for bearing the king's letters to the keeper of the wardrobe. The king rewarded John de Savoie, a messenger coming from the count of Tancarville and other French lords, with a gift of £10 between 3 and 30 November 1360.

Messengers carrying unspecified types of letter are found in the Nuncii of all the accounts save Beverley's. For example, Farley's account reveals that Thomas de London received 20s. for his expenses when sent from London to Calais with Edward's letters. An item in Gunthorpe's account indicates that Richard Cokes received 3s.4d. for carrying Philippa's letters from Windsor to Roger de Beauchamp at Denyse.

Messengers carrying letters of Edward's privy seal appear in Gunthorpe's and the first year of Wakefield's accounts. For example, Gunthorpe shows that John Robert was sent from Windsor to Arundel with letters of the privy seal addressed to Richard fitz Alan, earl of Arundel.

Letters of Edward's secret seal appear only in Gunthorpe's account. For example, on 26 April 1366 a series of entries reveals that men were sent with letters of the secret seal from Windsor to various places. The first entry notes that Thomas Loveden was sent to Southampton with the greatest speed and with guards (cum passagio defendendo). The remaining items state that the persons dispatched were "similarly sent". Ralph Chamberlain was sent to Lynn and Boston; Walter Aubrey to Bristol; John Legg to Chichester and Sussex; Thomas de Milton to Ipswich and Yarmouth; John de Assh to Plymouth and Cornwall; John Longevill to Kingston-upon-Hull and Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and Simon de Burgh to Dover and Kent.

Messengers dispatched by Edward and Philippa in order to seek or fetch certain individuals are found in Gunthorpe's and in the first year of Wakefield's accounts. For example, Gunthorpe shows that John Alein was sent on the queen's business from Windsor to Oxford seeking Master William Holm. In Wakefield's account, John Currour was sent from London to Marlborough to seek Henry Sturmyn.

Messengers were also dispatched on either Edward's or Philippa's business, or on Edward's secret business. Entries recording such trips appear in all the accounts. Thus, Beverley shows that William Blacomore was sent, on the orders of John of Gaunt, the duke of Lancaster, from Sheen to Hampton on Edward's business. The second year of Wakefield's account indicates that John Bath and Hanekinus Loder were sent from Gravensend to London on Edward's secret business. Gunthorpe shows that William de Ratescroft was sent on three occasions on the queen's business from Havering to the king at Clarendon.

The war with France resulted in the dispatch of some of the messengers mentioned in Farley's and Wakefield's accounts. In Farley's, for example, Thomas Freman was sent on Edward's business from Chartres to Reginald de Ferers at Honfleur. Henry Croft, king's messenger, on several occasions was sent from Calais to Windsor with Edward's letters. The account also contains references to the king's messengers sent on missions in England. For example, Stephen Messager and Andrew Messager, king's messengers, together were sent on Edward's business from Sandwich to London. It is doubtful that men of their specialized service would have been used on merely domestic affairs, unless they were the only individuals available. Their activity was possibly connected with the war.

Both years of Wakefield's account have entries dealing with Edward's war efforts. In the first year, for example, Robert de Watford was sent from Hamble to Sheen with letters to

Edward from William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, and Richard fitz Alan, earl of Arundel, admiral of the fleet; he returned to the two with Edward's letters. John York was sent from Alan de Buxhull in Yarmouth to Edward in London with letters which dealt with the condition of a certain large ship. John Bleburgh was sent by Buxhull from Blyborough to Orwell, on two occasions, on Edward's business regarding "the said ship", presumably the one mentioned above. As these examples show, Edward paid the expenses not only of those who carried his letters but also the expenses of those who bore letters to him. The example of Bleburgh also reveals that Edward paid as messengers persons who were not royal servants. In the second year of the account, William Prest and John Longevill were sent from Windsor to London and Yarmouth to prepare victuals for Edward's ships for his voyage. Two days later William Ratescroft was sent from Havering to Southampton with Edward's letters; he was also to inquire about Edward's ships in the same area.

Tout states[5] that Edward's health began to fail in 1369, and that from that time on he was periodically ill. Some entries in Wakefield's first year appear to be concerned with one of the king's illnesses. On 14 August 1371, Hugh Forester was sent with the greatest speed from Beverley to Oxford seeking Master William de Wymondham, physician. Between 14 and 18 August John Toret was sent with Edward's letters from Wyke to London with the greatest speed. On 18 August

Thomas Messager brought letters from prince Edward to Edward at Wyke. During that day numerous messengers were dispatched. From the king in Wyke, John Steigin was sent to Canterbury with letters to the prince, John Lambourne was sent to Lewis seeking the earl of Arundel, and Hans de Hanon was sent to London with letters seeking Master John Glaston, the king's physician. From Marlborough men were sent to various religious houses to offer wax in the king's name. John Stanlowe was sent to Westminster and Canterbury; William Cosyn to Chichester and Walsingham; Roger de Bovyndon to Bury St. Edmund's; and Walter Aubrey to Caversham and Chertsey. Between 18 and 21 August William Ratescroft was sent from Marlborough to Dartford seeking brother John Wodrove, the king's confessor.

Gunthorpe's account reveals that messengers were employed by the king during his hunting expenditions. William atte Churche was sent from Chertsey to Chesthunt seeking Edmund Fauconer, probably identical with Edmund Chesthunt, Edward's chief falconer. John Horeman was sent from Woodstock to Adderbury at night seeking Casinus Fauconer. Some messengers carried game, birds, or fish. John Bladon was sent from Woodstock to Chertsey with 24 mallards. Several entries reveal that men were sent by Edward to Philippa with game. John Horeman was sent from Woodstock to Chertsey with one buck fermes', while Peter, servant of Thomas de Stanes, took birds, and Geoffrey Amory a porpoise, from Sheppey to Windsor. Finally, John Stele was sent from Hadleigh to Sheen with 30 capons which he presented to the king. The account does not state who sent Stele.

Two entries give specific reasons for the dispatch of messengers. In Gunthorpe's account, William Thomas accompanied Enguerrande de Coucy, earl of Bedford, Edward's son-in-law, from Shipton to Hampton. The second year of Wakefield's account contains a confusing entry. William de Risceby was sent from Sheen to Kimbolton Castle to inform the king of the death of Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford. The entry is dated 30 November 1372 and the earl's death must have seemed near; he was apparently ill, but did not die until 16 January 1373.[6]

Most accounts contain entries which record no reason for the dispatch of messengers. Although it is impossible to ascertain definitely why there were sent, domestic considerations undoubtedly played a part, especially when Edward was absent from his household. Thus, Gunthorpe's account, which covers a period when Edward and Philippa were very active travellers, contains the greatest number of entries and the largest expenditure on messengers. Beverley's account contains an entry where no reason is given for the dispatch of messengers but one may be postulated with some assurance. On 21 June 1377 William Blacomore and Simon de Burgh were sent on Edward's business from Sheen to Dover. They received 60s. for expenses and for the hiring of horses. The fact that the entry is dated on the day that Edward died would suggest that they were to take or send news of the king's death to the continent.

As already mentioned, many letter carriers in Farley's account were king's messengers, such as Andrew Messager or Henry Croft, whereas in the other accounts they generally were household servants. Although it would seem likely that any household member could be pressed into service, a certain number were used fairly regularly. John Troll was out of court for extended periods of time delivering letters in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield. He does not appear in any of the Feoda et Robe. Richard de Lancastre, a household servant in Gunthorpe's account, and John Stigein and William Ratescroft, yeomen of the household in Gunthorpe's and Wakefield's accounts, were used frequently as messengers. Whether these men can be identified with the four household messengers, carry-overs from a time when the nuncii Regis were controlled by the wardrobe,[7] is impossible to say. The fact that Troll, Lancastre, and Stigein were paid daily expenses of either 3d. or 6d. may suggest that they were specialized messengers and not just men sent with messages.

King's messengers were paid their expenses, according to a standard daily rate in going between places, immediately prior to their being dispatched.[8] This would seem also to be the case in the Nuncii for persons sent on individual errands, as in the case of Blacomore and Burgh mentioned above. Messengers sent on a number of journeys over a period of time could be paid either before or during that period. For example, in the first year of Wakefield's account, William Magson and

Ralph Poter were sent out of court to various places with Edward's letters between 15 September and 26 October 1371, but they were paid 8s.4d. at Marlborough for their expenses on 31 August, two weeks before they supposedly performed their duties. In Gunthorpe's account John Stigein was out of court for 13 days between 10 September and 11 November 1366 when sent to various places with Edward's privy seal letters. Stigein received payment of his expenses, at 6d. per day, on 17 October. John Troll was out of court delivering letters of the king and queen for 140 days between 24 August 1366 and 31 January 1367. He was paid his expenses at 3d. per day on 11 January.

The Nuncii in both Ypres' and the second year of Wakefield's account each contain an entry which perhaps should have been placed in the Necessaria. Ypres shows that Robert de Whitbergh, almoner, was sent out of court on Edward's business to expedite the business of his office. The almoner was absent 40 days and received 5s. per day for his expenses. The second year of Wakefield's account reveals that Walter Whithors was sent out of court on the king's business for 81 days, receiving 12d. daily for his expenses.

The Nuncii records the expenses of messengers sent either with letters or on the king's business. In a few instances Edward also paid the expenses of those bringing letters to him. Aside from Farley's account which deals only with the war in France, the Nuncii reflect the domestic aspects of Edward's life. The Nuncii reveal Edward's decreasing activity, as is seen in the startling contrast between the Nuncii in Gunthorpe's and in Beverley's accounts. The former has 53 items, with men being dispatched from a long list of places where Edward stayed. The latter has only two missions, and in the second of these men were probably sent to announce Edward's death.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XI

[1] The total expenses are: Farley - £10 9s.10d.; Gunthorpe - £30 17s.3d.; Ypres - £10 18s.4d.; Wakefield (year 1) - £18 2s.4d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £11 6s.; and Beverley - 73s.4d. Several expenses in Hill, King's Messengers, p. 148, are either incomplete or incorrect within the time periods recorded.

[2] The secret seal is perhaps identical with the signet seal. The secret seal accompanied the king in his travels, and was kept in the chamber. It expressed Edward's personal wishes, and was used to authenticate royal letters and mandates of original force or as a warrant ordering the keeper of the privy seal and the chancellor to issue certain writs (see Tout, Chapters, V, pp. 161-81).

[3] Hill, King's Messengers, p. 16.

[4] See p. 129.

[5] Chapters, IV, p. 182.

[6] Complete Peerage, vol. VI, p. 474, and n.6.

[7] Hill, King's Messengers, p. 136.

[8] Ibid., pp. 104-105.

CHAPTER XII

VADIA VENATORUM ET PUTURA CANUM AND VADIA FALCONARIORUM ET PUTURA FALCONUM

Some expenses relating to the chase and hawking occur in all accounts under the headings Vadia Venatorum et Putura Canum (Wages of Hunters and the Food Allowances of Dogs) and Vadia Falconariorum et Putura Falconum (Wages of Falconers and the Food Allowances of Falcons). Farley's account combines the two types of expenses under the latter heading. The tituli record the names of hunters and falconers and the daily wages they received, as well as the daily rate of food allowances for dogs and falcons in their care. Although the wages paid household servants normally appear in the Hospicium expenses, that titulus records only payments to persons actually at court. Huntsmen and falconers were generally prevented from being in court because of their tasks.

Entries recording these wages take two forms. In Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts, chronologically entered items record short periods for which a person received wages. Thus, many men appear several times in an account as the recipients of payments. In the accounts of Ypres and Wakefield, falconers and hunters received payment for specified numbers of days within the entire accounting period. In Beverley's account wages were calculated twice, before and after Edward's death. After 22 July 1377 the staff was decreased by almost two-thirds, but those retained were paid for the entire period until the household was disbanded. The entries in the latter three accounts tend to be listed in an order of decreasing rates of wages.

The Vadia Venatorum and the Vadia Falconariorum add to the list of known household servants provided by the Feoda et Robe since most hunters and falconers received neither robes nor footwear.[1] Presumably they usually were absent from court when liveries were made; in addition, many were of ranks lower than yeomen for which Edward did not have to provide robes or footwear. The second year of Wakefield's account may serve as an example. In the Vadia Venatorum, 20 men received payments of wages or allowances; only 4 of them appear in the Feoda et Robe. The Vadia Falconariorum shows that 29 men received payments, but only 10 of them also occur in the Feoda et Robe.[2] However, just as the Feoda et Robe does not name all the hunters and falconers, so the Vadia Venatorum and the Vadia Falconariorum do not record wages for of all the hunters and falconers named in the accounts. For example, Ypres' account reveals that 12 men, of whom 4 were yeomen, received wages in the Vadia Venatorum, yet the Feoda et Robe names 20 yeomen hunters, of whom only one received wages. Farley's Dona states that 10 king's hunters each received a gift of 24s., but 3 of these men appear neither in the Feoda et Robe nor in the Vadia Falconariorum.

The expenses in the Vadia Venatorum and the Vadia Falconariorum presumably reflect Edward's personal interest in hunting and hawking as well as the hunting staff's task of providing fresh meat for the household, but the entries give little precise information about either. The king's hunting activities are mentioned only once. An undated entry in Gunthorpe's Vadia Venatorum states that John de Hibernia and Nicholas Vyleyn, greyhound keepers, received payment for wages and the food allowances for 12 greyhounds in going and returning with the king, for 4 days between Langley and Moorend, presumably on a royal hunt.

The expenses of hawking were always greater than those of hunting.[3] This is perhaps indicative of Edward's personal taste, although the care and training of hawks may have required more men than the care and training of dogs. Few high ranking hunters are named in comparison with the many named high ranking falconers. Aside from Gunthorpe's account, more falconers than huntsmen received wages, although many men in Gunthorpe's Vadia Venatorum were of low rank and received wages for only a few days.

Falconers received wages both in and out of court; their subordinates received wages only for periods spent out of court. Falconers receiving wages in and out of court include the master falconer, although he is never given that title, who received 12d. per day both in and out of court, those who received 12d. out of court and 7 1/2d. in court, and those who received 6d. and 3d. respectively. Subordinate falconers were paid daily wages out of court either of 2d. or 3d; porters of falcons received 2d. per day. Individuals paid on the above scale of wages appear in all the accounts. Falconers from outside Edward's household could also receive wages from the king. Hamnus, a falconer of William de Montague, earl of Salisbury, received royal wages for the entire period covered by the second year of Wakefield's account at either 3d. per day in court or 6d. per day out of court.

Hunters and subordinates were paid wages only for periods of time spent out of court. The master hunter, mentioned only in Farley's account, received 12d. per day. That account records the only other instance of a hunter, described as an esquire, receiving this wage. Yeoman hunters and grooms receiving 2d. and 1 1/2d. respectively in daily wages appear in all accounts. Only Farley and Gunthorpe record wages to yeomen hunters higher than 2d.; they list daily wages of 3d.,4d., and 6d.

Why wages for yeomen hunters in the accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley were so low is not explained, and it is strange that no high ranking hunters are mentioned except in Farley's account. Perhaps high ranking hunters no longer were part of the household staff, or perhaps they were attached to the court in some other capacity.[4]

The Vadia Venatorum of all the accounts (but not Farley's Vadia Falconariorum) show that certain individuals, who were not themselves paid wages, received payments for dogs' food allowances or for servants' wages. John de Beverle and Ralph Tyle, for example, are mentioned in several accounts. In the first year of Wakefield's account, Beverley was paid for the wages of 3 men and for the food allowances of 9 greyhounds and 24 coursing hounds for 248 days between 27 June 1371 and 28 June 1372. Gunthorpe's account states that Ralph Tyle was paid for the wages of a page and for the food allowances of 9 greyhounds for 7 days between 10 and 24 December 1366.

Beverle and Tyle may have been hunters, but they received household wages in other capacities. Beverle is described as an esquire of the chamber in Ypres' and the first year of Wakefield's accounts, and Tyle as a yeoman of the chamber in Ypres'. Ypres' Vadia Falconariorum indicates that 7 porters "of the king's chamber" received payment of wages out of court, while Beverley's Vadia Venatorum reveals that John Archebald was paid for out of court food allowances of greyhounds described as being "of the king's chamber". If porters and greyhounds could be described as "of the king's chamber" and chamber personnel received payments for food allowances and servants' wages, then perhaps high ranking hunters were attached to the chamber.

Gunthorpe's account shows that Edward augmented his own hunting staff with outside huntsmen upon occasion. For example, a hunter of the abbess of Shaftesbury received wages for 49 days and a hunter of Thomas, Edward's son, for 33 days.

Farley's account and Gunthorpe's Vadia Venatorum include wages paid to persons other than hunters. For example, in Farley's account Richard Shiren, a carpenter, received 4 1/2d. per day for 82 days. Gunthorpe's account shows that Walter Parker, keeper of the gate of Havering Park, was paid daily wages of 2d. for 57 days, while John de Canston, keeper of the queen's lions, received 1 1/2d. per day for 34 days.

In addition to regular wages, all the accounts but Farley's mention payments for the recipient's sustenance, described as "wages of his mouth" (pro vadiis oris suis). These were paid both in and out of court and presumably were payments of money in lieu of eating in the hall. They normally replaced regular wages for short periods. In Ypres' account, Edmund Chesthunt, a falconer, received 12d. per day for the 36 days spent out of court between 19 March and 23 April 1369, except for two days in court when he received 4 1/2d. daily for his sustenance. Chesthunt received regular daily wages of 7 1/2d. in court. Hanekinus Bene, a falconer in Gunthorpe's account, received daily wages of 3d. within court for the 78 days between 15 November 1366 and 31 January 1367, and additional wages of 3d. daily for his sustenance out of court for 16 days within the same period. Bene's normal wages out of court were 6d. per day. A few men were issued payments for their sustenance for considerable periods. For example, the Vadia Venatorum of the second year of Wakefield's account shows that Thomas Campsale, a hunter, received 2d. per day for his sustenance for 278 days out of court.

Food allowances for birds and dogs were paid only for periods when they were out of court.[5] Falconers were issued a daily food allowance of 1d. for falcons, 1 1/2d. for goshawks, 1d. or 1 1/2d. for gerfalcons, and 1/2d. for dogs. The daily rates paid to hunters for the food allowances of dogs are more varied. Payments for greyhounds were generally 3/4d. per day, although allowances of 1/2d. and 1d. also are recorded. Food allowances for coursing hounds generally were 1/2d. per day, but payments of 3/4d. for 2 dogs or of 3/4d. per dog also occur. In Farley's account the daily food allowances of bloodhounds was 1d. and of terriers 3/4d.

Although birds and dogs were normally in the custody of household falconers and hunters, there are several instances where they were in the custody of others. In Gunthorpe's account, for example, Henry Curtys was paid on 4 separate occasions for greyhounds in the custody of the abbot of Bury.

While the royal household contained a number of non-household huntsmen and falconers, only one entry records the presence of outside animals. In Gunthorpe's account, William Litelwhite was paid for 7 days' food allowances for 3 greyhounds of John Hastings, earl of Pembroke, a minor.

Ypres' account has some interesting expenses related to falcons. Robert de Wylughby was paid wages of 6d. per day for 135 days for staying out of court at les Meus. He purchased 4 quarters 2 bushels of barley and peas for food for pigeons, birds bought as food for the falcons. The purchases cost 28s. 10d.

The expenses of horses appear in all but Gunthorpe's account. In Farley's, some 15 horses were in the custody of various hunters and falconers; the food allowance of horses varied from 3d. to 3 1/2d. daily, but was generally 3 1/4d. For example, Frapinus Fauconer was paid 3 1/2d. per day for 78 days for the expenses of a horse, while Hugh Fauconer received daily 3 1/4d. for the expenses of a horse and 2d. for the wages of a groom for a total of 363 days. The *Vadia Falconariorum* of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley show that for the entire accounting periods John Parker daily received 2d. for his own wages and 3d. for the expenses of a horse.

Except for a few entries in Farley's and Gunthorpe's accounts, the entries do not specify where the expenses recorded were incurred or when or how payments for them were made. The payment, mentioned previously,[6] to men who accompanied Edward between Langley and Moorend is an example of an entry recording where expenses were incurred.

Huntsmen, and presumably also falconers, could receive payments for wages and food allowances before or after periods spent out of court. In Gunthorpe's account, William Archebald received payment on 1 May 1366 for his wages and food allowances for 11 days spent out of court between 7 and 23 April; Ives de Camera, Nicholas Colman, and Gilbert Veautrer were paid at Havering on 26 July for the 5 days to be spent out of court between 26 and 30 July.

Presumably, expenses would normally be paid by the household, but both Farley's and Gunthorpe's Vadia Falconariorum contain an example of falconers receiving payments of wages and food allowances from sheriffs. Farley's account shows that Thomas de Musgrave, sheriff of York, paid nearly £15 for the wages of falconers and porters and for the food allowances of falcons. Gunthorpe's account reveals that Geoffrey Waryn, falconer, received wages of 6d. per day out of court for 124 days between 30 September 1366 and 31 January 1367, deducting a 10d. overpayment in the wages paid him on 5 March 1366 by the sheriff of Norfolk. Waryn had been out of court for 7 days between 27 February and 5 March.

The Vadia Venatorum and the Vadia Falconariorum record the wages paid huntsmen and falconers and the food allowances of dogs and falcons. No information is provided about the provision of game for the household and little about Edward's hunting activities. However, the tituli do add to the list of household servants because many of the lower ranking members of the hunting and hawking staff are not mentiond in the Feoda et Robe. The last three accounts do not mention a master hunter or other high ranking hunters, but since dogs were still attached to the household such hunters presumably existed. They may have been attached to the chamber where they would have been in personal contact with the king.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XII

[1] See p. 169.

[2] The following figures represent the named hunters and falconers who received wages and who are not described as non-household servants. The figures in the brackets represent the number who are not listed in the *Feoda et Robe*. Farley - 19 (9) and 45 (26); Gunthorpe - 55 (48) and 34 (7); Ypres - 12 (11) and 34 (20); Wakefield (year 1) - 14 (13) and 25 (17); Wakefield (year 2) - 20 (16) and 29 (19); and Beverley - 17 (17) and 43 (28).

[3] Farley's account has a combined expenditure of £863 16s.6 1/4d. Of this sum, £268 7s.3d. was spent on hunting, £589 4s.2 1/4d. on hawking, and £6 5s.1d. is unallocable. The amounts spent on hunting and hawking in the other accounts are: Gunthorpe - £100 7s. 1/2d. and £245 8s.5d.; Ypres - £40 1s.8 1/4d. and £128 7s. 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 1) - £60 18s.8 1/2d. and £187 8s.2 1/2d.; Wakefield (year 2) - £46 19 1/4d. and £222 17s.1 1/2d.; and Beverley - £23 19s.7 1/4d. and £181 16s.2 1/2d.

[4] It is possible that huntsmen were stationed out of court and so received their emoluments from local sources, but by the fourteenth century they held their positions by appointment, not through sergeantries (John H. Round, *The King's Serjeantries and Officers of State With Their Coronation Services* (1911: reprint, New York, Barnes and Noble, 1970), p. 289, and Nellie Neilson, "The Forests", *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336: Volume I - Central and Prerogative Administration*, James F. Willard and William A. Morris, eds. (Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America, 1940), p. 435.

[5] The damages caused by dogs when out of court are mentioned on p. 194.

[6] See above, p. 218.

CHAPTER XIII

VADIA GUERRE

Only Farley's and the first year of Wakefield's accounts contain tituli entitled Vadia Guerre (Wages of War). The Vadia Guerre records the details of war wages and, in Farley's account, other war expenses incurred. Actual payment is found in the Recepta Scaccarii. Years could pass before a person received all that was owing to him.[1]

Wakefield's Vadia Guerre contains only one entry. Hugh Fastolf and his brother John, who do not appear in the Feoda et Robe, received wages for themselves and unnamed men for living aboard one of the king's large ships during its voyage from Great Yarmouth to the Thames, a task which occupied 39 days between 28 October and 5 December 1371. The two brothers received wages for themselves and for 22 men-at-arms at 12d. each, for 16 hobelars at 8d. each, and for 38 archers at 6d. each, and, deducting wages for men absent at one time or another, were paid £97 12s.4d. A marginal entry notes that the payment was authorized by a writ of the privy seal dated 14 December 1371. The Recepta Scaccarii states that the trip was between Kirkelerod' and London, not Great Yarmouth and the Thames, and that payment was made in two installments, on 27 October 1371 and 12 February 1372.[2] Presumably the first was an advance, the second the remaining money owing to the

Fastolfs.

The Vadia Guerre of Farley's account covers some 35 folios and has a total expenditure of £133,820 16s.6 1/2d. The titulus records the war wages paid during the Rheims campaign of 1359-60. Recipients include warriors from both England and the empire who indented or contracted[3] to serve with retinues of soldiers, as well as a few English archers and Edward's household servants. Only those receiving wages directly from Edward are named; members of retinues are unidentified. The entries record the particulars of the daily wages and the periods of service for the leaders of the indentured troops, as well as the number of men in their retinues, and their ranks, periods of service, and daily wages. The Vadia Guerre also records the payments of rewards or regards (rewardi) to nobles and members of their retinues, payments of compensation for horses lost, and payments for transporting horses to and from Calais.

Payments to named individuals are recorded in descending order of rank, commencing with Edward, prince of Wales, and ending with the archers. Only the most important warriors received payments in all the categories mentioned above. For example, Edward, prince of Wales, received a total of £24,405 7s.3 1/2d. Of this sum, £16,557 9s. was for wages for himself and for 7 bannerets, 136 knights, 443 esquires, and 900 archers for the 273 days between 2 September 1359 and 31 May 1360. For his reward and that of his men-at-arms, he received £3,913

19 1/2d. Compensation for the loss of 395 horses amounted to £3,355 6s.8d. The prince received £277 3s.4d. for the passage of 1369 horses to Calais and £352 6s.8d. for the repassage of 2114 horses to England. Henry Percy, banneret, received wages for himself and for 12 knights, 57 esquires, and 70 archers, as well as payments of rewards, of restitution of horses lost, and of transportation to and from Calais. Among the lower ranked individuals, John Bluet, king's sergeant-at-arms, received wages for himself and an archer, and payments for a lost horse and for the transport of horses to England. Thomas de Hampton, king's minstrel, received wages only for himself.

A total of 584 men are named in the Vadia Guerre, of whom almost half are also named in the Feoda et Robe. One-quarter were warriors from the empire and the remainder Englishmen.

The English warriors named include Edward's sons, Edward, prince of Wales, Lionel, earl of Ulster, and John, earl of Richmond, as well as Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, William de Bohun, earl of Northampton, Roger de Mortimer, earl of March, Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, Robert de Ufford, earl of Suffolk, Ralph de Stafford, earl of Stafford, William de Montague, earl of Salisbury, and Richard fitz Alan, earl of Arundel. Lesser English warrior include Walter de Manny and John Chandos. Nobles from the Empire include the margrave of Meissen[4] and the count of Nido.

A total of 284 men are named in both the Vadia Guerre and the Feoda et Robe. The latter records 592 names.[5] Some, such as bannerets and knights, were temporary additions to the household staff, but most were ordinary household servants. Among the household servants named in the Vadia Guerre are the keeper, steward, controller, and cofferer, as well as the keeper of the privy seal and various clerks of the offices and privy seal. Also named are 2 physicians and 2 surgeons, 14 minstrels, 11 hunters, and 13 falconers. Only one domestic office is mentioned in the Vadia Guerre: eight named yeomen of the poultry received war wages. None of these appear in the Feoda et Robe and the office of the poultry does not figure in the Hospicium expenses, as it does in the other accounts.

Although the army was accompanied by an enormous baggage train to carry all its needs for a winter campaign,[6] none of the household carters, palfreymen, or sumptermen are named as receiving war wages. Most of the archers and king's messengers, temporary military additions to the household staff, also do not appear by name in the Vadia Guerre. The same is true of many of the hunters and falconers found in the Vadia Falconariorum. Perhaps these men remained in England to carry on their duties, as is the case with John Elis, hunter, who received ordinary wages between 5 November 1359 and 27 September 1360. However, ordinary wages are recorded only for hunters and falconers during the campaigning period. The Hospicium expenses do not record wages until 30 June 1360, after the campaign was over. It seems unlikely that household servants not appearing in the Vadia Guerre were dismissed for the duration of the campaign, because they received robes and footwear for that precise period, while an entry in the Dona suggests that these servants accompanied Edward on the continent. A Nicholas Fauconer, falconer, who received winter and summer robes for 1359-60, was granted a gift of £10 on 12 January 1360 in payment of his ransom, because he had been captured by the French. No Nicholas Fauconer appears in the Vadia Guerre, but the Vadia Falconariorum reveals that two men of the same name each received wages until 24 December 1359. If most of the household servants not named in the Vadia Guerre did accompany Edward, it is not certain how they were paid their wages. It seems unlikely that they should have received none. They might have formed part of Edward's personal retinue, except that none is listed. Possibly they formed parts of the retinues of others, especially of the more important household servants.

The daily rates of war wages paid in Farley's account are listed in Table V. However, not all persons named in the titulus personally received wages. For example, Edward's son Edmund of Langley, a minor, did not himself receive wages, but was paid for the wages and expenses of a retinue which he supplied.

In a number of instances wages of double the standard rate were paid. During the campaign, Thomas Beauchamp, earl

TABLE V

DAILY RATES OF WAR WAGES IN FARLEY'S ACCOUNT

Prince of Wales	20s.
Duke, margrave	13s.4d.
Earl, count	6s.8d.
Banneret, keeper of wardrobe or privy seal, steward of household	4s.
Knight, controller or cofferer of wardrobe, clerk of offices, physician, standard bearer	2s.
Esquire, clerk, surgeon, constable,* sergeant of offices, sergeant-at-arms, herald of arms, falconer, minstrel, master minder or carpenter	12d.
Household archer	8d.
Yeoman of chamber or offices, yeoman falconer or hunter, yeoman (carpenter, miner, mason), archer physician,* chaplain,* standard-bearer,* mounted archer, messenger	6d.
Vintenar,* crier*	4d.
Groom, porter	3d.
Groom, Welsh footman*	2d.

---

*These were members of Welsh contingents (see p. 234). The vintenar (*vintenarius*) was the commander of of twenty soldiers (see *vintena* in Latham, *Word-List*, p. 513).

of Warwick, received the normal wages for himself and his retinue, but from 25 May to 29 September 1360 he was the king's lieutenant in Normandy and he and his (smaller) retinue were paid double wages.[7] Presumably, the earl received double wages because of the status of the office assumed, while the double wages for his retinue may have been to attract men. Three sergeants-at-arms and one sergeant received double wages because they were the king's standard-bearers (causa vexilli Regis). For instance, Richard Cortenhale, sergeant-at-arms, received 12d. per day from 10 to 29 September 1359, but from 30 September to 2 June 1360 he received 2s. daily as the king's standard-bearer.

Payment of war wages in most cases commenced before the nominal beginning of the account on 3 November 1359. This is due to the fact that Edward had originally hoped to set out in August. Thus, some men began receiving wages in June, although wages starting in August or September are more usual. Warriors received full wages from the time they commenced service. Many household servants named in the Vadia Guerre (excluding bannerets and knights) received two rates of wages and were paid the one listed in Table V only from 30 September 1359. Prior to this they received lesser wages. Thus, up to 29 September the keeper was paid daily wages of 2s., the cofferer and clerks of the offices 16 1/2d., other clerks 4 1/2d. or 9d., esquires or men of equal rank 4 1/2d. or 7 1/2d., and yeomen 3d. Thus, the administrative and domestic household staff did not begin to receive full war wages until actual military activities had begun when the duke of Lancaster apparently set out for Calais. He landed there on or about 1 October and raided French territory. Prior to this they may have still been receiving regular household wages. Nevertheless, while many household servants received two rates of wages, members of retinues were paid full war wages for the entire period of the leaders' services.

War time and peace time wages can be compared for hunters and falconers since the details of their regular wages are recorded in the account. Only 7 men are common to the Vadia Guerre and the Vadia Falconariorum. Three esquire falconers and one esquire hunter received 12d. per day for both types of wage. Three yeomen hunters received 6d. daily for war wages, but only one was paid similar regular wages. The other two were paid 4d. per day.

Farley's account reveals that on 30 September 1359, the day on which most household servants began to receive normal war wages, and presumably the day on which actual hostilities were reckoned to have begun, approximately 10,900 men were receiving war wages. Most of the English forces were retained until the end of the campaign, but the majority of the mercenaries from the empire were dismissed soon after Edward landed in Calais on 28 October. The Dona reveals that such warriors were not sent home empty handed, but obviously the force collected at Calais was too large for a winter campaign.[8]

During the winter contingents of English archers and others were also dismissed. For example, John de Kyngeston provided 100 archers who received wages until 4 December 1359. Oweyn de Charleton[9] provided a retinue of Welshmen consisting of 10 constables, 10 chaplains, 10 doctors, 10 standard-bearers, and 10 criers, 50 vintenars, and 920 footmen from 23 September to 9 November 1359. The force was more than halved on the latter date and this smaller contingent was dismissed on 27 January 1360. Stephen atte Merssh, smith, received wages for 24 yeomen smiths until 9 November 1359, but only for 17 after this date. Although the Vadia Guerre reveals that in February and March of 1360 new mercenaries were hired, only about 7,500 men were receiving war wages on 8 May 1360, the date of the signing of the Treaty of Brétigny.

English soldiers continued to receive war wages until they returned to England. Wages generally ceased by the end of May, although a few were paid into early June.[10] Only a handful of men received wages for periods after this. The earl of Warwick, Edward's lieutenant in Normandy, received wages until 29 September 1360. Several of Edward's guides in France received wages into July. For example, William Rascaille received 12d. per day from 4 November 1359 to 26 July 1360. Perhaps the guides served the earl of Warwick after the end of the campaign.

Excluding household servants, few men below the rank of esquire are named in the titulus. The exceptions are those archers who were not members of retinues. For example, three archers of Roger de Mortimer, earl of March, received a daily wage of 6d. from 28 February to 28 May 1360. The earl died on 29 February.[11] Nevertheless, almost two-fifths of his retinue continued to receive wages in his name until 6 May.

Members of retinues, except those of continental mercenaries which included no one lower in rank than esquire, ranked from bannerets to Welsh footmen. The composition and size of any retinue obviously depended upon the rank of the leader. The prince of Wales had bannerets, knights, esquires, and archers in his retinue; John Sturmy, a sergeant of the offices, had one archer in his employ. Men receiving 6d. per day or less had no retinues. Although there appears to be no definite formula governing the size of retinues,[12] for high ranking English nobles and the chief household officers, the number of men-at-arms (including the leader, and bannerets, knights, and esquires, if any) was more or less equal to the number of archers. For example, John of Gaunt, earl of Richmond, provided 200 men-at-arms (including himself) and 200 archers. Edward le Despenser, banneret, received wages for 60 men-at-arms and 60 archers, while John de Foxle, knight, received wages for 2 men-at-arms and 2 archers. Nearly all those household servants who received daily wages of 12d. also received wages for one archer.

In addition to wages, the Vadia Guerre records payments for rewards or regards (rewardi),[13] compensation for horses lost, and the transport of horses to and from Calais. None of the continental mercenaries received any of these payments.

Rewards were granted to the leaders of English retinues, both for themselves and for their men-at-arms. Leaders given rewards ranked, with one exception, as knights or above. In reality, few knights received rewards, but most bannerets and all the high ranking English nobles did. Members of retinues granted rewards ranked as esquires or above. The normal rate of the reward was approximately 5 3/4d. per day,[14] although the rate in the accounts varies, probably depending upon the method used to calculate the reward. For example, the earl of Suffolk received a reward of £386 15s.10d. for himself, 19 knights, and 40 esquires for the 265 days between 10 September 1359 and 31 May 1360. This reward amounts to approximately 6d. per man per day. Edmund of Langley received £131 6s.3 3/4d. as a reward for his 21 men-at-arms for the 261 days between 13 September 1359 and 30 May 1360. This amounts to a reward of 5 3/4d. per man per day. Edmund Rose,[15] who ranked below a knight, was granted a total reward of £43 18s.11 3/4d., at about 5 3/4d. per day, for himself and 6 companions for the 271 days between 4 September and 31 May, deducting 30s. because one man-at-arms was absent for 60 days. In one case alone is it stated why rewards were paid. Two esquires of lord William de Clee, the controller of the household, received £12 6s.3 1/2d. "for keeping watch about the king's person" for 257 days between 21 September 1359 and 3 June 1360.

Persons entering Edward's military service had their horses appraised before embarking; Edward was obliged to pay that value in compensation should the horse be lost in his service.[16] Such payments occur in the present titulus, although most horses are not described. In one case only is a horse said to have died (mortuus); the other horses had been lost (perditus). If a distinction was being made, it is not a clear one. Household servants who received daily wages of 6d. or less also did not receive compensation. Since nearly all received payment for the transport of one horse from Calais to England (but did not bring horses to France), and since it is inconceivable that not one of these men lost a horse, it is likely that they did not have horses of their own but were riding or looking after the king's horses.

The third type of payment received by named individuals was the cost of transporting horses between England and Calais at the beginning and at the end of the campaign. The cost of this transport was reckoned at a rate of 3s.4d. per horse.[17] Payments for the passage of horses to the continent seem to have been made only to the higher ranking members of Edward's force, but payments for the return passage of horses to England were made to all ranks of the English contingent, although not everyone received such payments. Why these distinctions were made, the Vadia Guerre does not reveal.

There seems to have been no limit as to the number of horses a man could bring to and from England. However, most of the nobles returned to England with more horses than they brought.[18] For example, the earl of Richmond was paid for the passage of 741 horses and for the repassage of 792 horses. In addition, he lost 62 horses for which he received compensation. The reason for the differences is not stated, although it is possible that the horses had been seized or bought during the campaign. Neither Edmund of Langley nor the duke of Lancaster received payment for transporting horses to Calais, yet they were paid for transporting 145 and 1,611 horses respectively to England. Both were also paid for horses lost. Presumably, either these horses were obtained in Calais or the costs of transportation to Calais were not paid by the king. Finally, the earl of Warwick provides an example of a noble who brought more horses to Calais (398) than he took from Calais (193). He also lost 20 horses. What happened to the remaining horses is not revealed.

In Wakefield's account, the Vadia Guerre records payment of wages to Hugh and John Fastolf and others for guarding one of the king's ships between Great Yarmouth and the Thames. Payments in Farley's account were made, for the most part, to actual participants in the campaign of 1359-60. Not only were wages paid, but the Vadia Guerre also records payments of rewards, compensation for horses lost, and transport of horses to and from Calais. Members of Edward's forces included English nobles, continental warriors, and Edward's household servants. These forces totalled about 10,900 on 30

September 1359, the day on which the duke of Lancaster presumably embarked for Calais to commence hostilities, and about 7,500 on 8 May 1360, when the Treaty of Brétigny was signed.

Although the household's involvement in national and international affairs was virtually nonexistent during the last few decades of Edward's reign, the Vadia Guerre of Farley's account indicates that the household could be used when necessary. Normally, war expenses had no part in a wardrobe book, a book which dealt only with the domestic expenses of the king's household. However, in case of need the king could, and did, use the clerical skills of his household staff for other purposes. The clerks of the king's household, who naturally accompanied Edward as part of his household, were made responsible for paying and recording expenses incurred during the campaign. The wardrobe acted only as a disbursing agent for the exchequer; it did not pay these expenses out of any right. The wardrobe was there, its staff was skilled, and it was responsible to the exchequer. It would have been superfluous for the exchequer to send its own staff to handle these payments. When the wardrobe presented its account for these war expenses, they were made part of its normal account, the wardrobe book.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

[1] See pp. 19, 32 ff., 58.

[2] See pp. 29-30.

[3] See Albert E. Prince, "The Indenture System Under Edward III", *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. Jamed G. Edwards, Vivian H. Galbraith, and Ernest F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), pp. 283-97.

[4] See p. 189.

[5] See Table III, p. 173.

[6] Alfred H. Burne, *The Crecy War - A Military History of the Hundred Years War from 1337 to the Peace of Bretigny, 1360* (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955), pp. 327-28, 330.

[7] See pp. 50, 54 n. 20.

[8] Burne, *Crecy War*, pp. 328-31.

[9] See p. 189.

[10] One item does state that Alexander Dynby and 10 companions, archers of the king's household, received daily wages of 8d. from 8 to 24 October 1360. However, the *anno .xxxiiij.*^{to} is interlinear, probably written by a later hand. It appears that the scribe made an error, since the *Vadia Pacis* shows that Dynby received wages of peace from 1 June 1360 to 12 February 1361. Although there are a few instances where the payments for the last days of war wages overlaps the first few days of wages of peace, such would certainly not be the case for Dynby. Presumably, 1359 is meant. There are other examples of persons receiving wages for only short periods before Edward's campaign even began. For instance, Thomas Penitour received 10d. per day from 5 September to 5 October 1359.

[11] However, see p. 119 n. 21.

[12] See, however, the list of leaders and their retinues for earlier campaigns in Herbert J. Hewitt, The Organization of War under Edward III, 1338-1362 (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1966), pp. 35-36.

[13] See Prince, "Indenture System", pp. 293-94.

[14] Prince, (ibid., p. 293) states that the rate was "100 marcs for the service of thirty men-at-arms during a quarter of a year."

[15] See pp. 58, 141.

[16] Hewitt, Organization of War, p. 87 and n.3; Prince, "Indenture System", p. 294.

[17] See Prince, "Indenture System", p. 295 n.1. Chandos was also paid this rate for the 1359-60 campaign.

[18] See Hewitt, Organization of War, Table IX, p. 88. There are, however, several errors. Thus, the earl of Richmond returned with 792 horses; the earl of Warwick sent 398 horses to Calais and returned with 193; and Walter Manny sent 104.

CHAPTER XIV

VADIA PACIS

A somewhat puzzling titulus, the Vadia Pacis (Wages of Peace), occurs only in Farley's account. It records the details of wages of peace totalling £431 9 1/4d. earned by 79 men.[1] Precisely what was meant by the term wages of peace is never explained, nor is it stated how such wages differed from ordinary or war wages.

The first entry in the titulus[2] is the only one to state what services were performed for these wages. John Crook, Leo de Perton, Robert de Hampton, and 20 unnamed companions, all esquires of the household,[3] each received daily wages of peace of 12d. for 29 days within Farley's accounting period for staying and guarding the king of France during his passage from England to Calais. The 29 days must have fallen between 31 May and 10 July 1360, since the three named esquires were receiving war wages until 31 May and the king arrived in Calais on 10 July.[4] The daily war wages of an esquire were the same as the wages of peace recorded in this entry.

The rest of the titulus is concerned with the wages of peace paid to 56 named men for definite periods of time falling between 20 September 1359 and 6 May 1361, the earliest and latest dates for which this type of wage is recorded. The men include, in the general order they appear in the titulus, 12 minstrels, 3 yeomen of the chamber (one of whom was attended by a named groom), one yeoman of the offices, 2 sergeants-at-arms, one surgeon, one esquire, 2 clerks of the privy seal, 32 archers, plus one man whose position is not given.

The daily wages of peace for these 56 individuals ranged from 12d. to 3d. The esquire, the clerks of the privy seal, and most of the minstrels received 7 1/2d. per day, a rate less than that allowed for war wages,[5] but equal to the wages men of these ranks received prior to the beginning of the campaign.[6] Two minstrels received 6 1/2d. per day, although one of these was paid only 4 1/2d. for part of the period he was paid wages. The yeomen, most of the archers, and the man whose position is not given received 6d. per day. For the yeomen and the archers this rate was the same as that for their daily war wages. Two archers and the groom received 3d. per day.

Excluding the esquires of the first entry, most men commenced their wages of peace at the end of the campaigning period; many went directly from war wages to wages of peace. Only 5 men, including the 2 sergeants-at-arms, the esquire, and one of the clerks of the privy seal, were receiving wages of peace on 8 May 1360, the day of the signing of the Treaty of Brétigny. For example, Thomas de Staple, sergeant-at-arms, was paid wages of peace from 29 September 1359, the earliest date such wages were paid, to 7 November 1360, while William de Dighton, clerk of the privy seal, received war wages until 11 January 1360 and wages of peace from 12 January to 24 December. A total of 53 men were receiving wages of peace on 1 June. For example, Richard de Armis, yeoman of the chamber, received war wages until 18 May 1360 and wages of peace for himself and his groom from 19 May to 1 November. Elie le Pipere, minstrel, who had not received war wages, was paid wages of peace from 19 May to 12 December 1360. Of the 3 men who commenced wages of peace after 1 June, one was Master Richard de Wy, surgeon, who was paid war wages until 2 June and wages of peace from 3 June 1360 until 26 March 1361.

In several instances, war wages and wages of peace overlapped. Roger Fromard and Peter Roos, minstrels, for example, were paid war wages to 2 June but began their wages of peace on 19 May. It seems unlikely that they were intentionally paid two sets of wages for this period, but since neither was charged with prests, the overpayments were apparently not discovered.

Men began to be paid off by 7 November 1360, the nominal end of the accounting period. On that date, 54 men were receiving wages of peace. Three men, including one of the sergeants-at-arms and the esquire, ceased their wages before 12 December, the last day on which the 12 minstrels received wages. The wages of 6 men, including the other sergeant-at-arms, and the clerks of the privy seal, stopped on 24 December. After that date, 33 men, of whom 29 were archers, were receiving wages of peace. The wages of the archers stopped on 12

February 1361. The surgeon was one of the 4 remaining men receiving wages of peace. The last payment of wages of peace was made to William de Naples, a yeoman of the chamber, who was paid for a period ending on 6 May 1361.

The 23 esquires who guarded king John on his trip from England to Calais, and presumably for some time before and after, obviously formed a military escort. Why their wages, which were the same value as their war wages would have been, were called wages of peace cannot be determined.

It is difficult to explain why a miscellaneous collection of people, ranging from a surgeon to minstrels to archers, would have received wages of peace. Nothing suggests that they attended king John other than the fact that the entries recording their wages of peace follow the entry recording the wages of the 23 esquires who did. The group composed by these miscellaneous men might have formed a company to guard, serve, and, in the case of the minstrels, amuse king John, except that nearly all continued to receive wages long after he had been released on 25 October 1360.

One possible explanation for the term wages of peace can be suggested. The term may have been devised by Farley to describe the war wages paid to a military contingent (the 23 esquires) after the hostilities had ended. With a few exceptions, the Vadia Guerre records war wages only until the beginning of June 1360.[7] To this entry was added the wages of a number of men who, for some unexplained reason, began or continued to receive war wages after the military campaign had ended. For some the wages of peace were equal to regular war wages, but for others they were equal only to the lesser rates of war wages paid some household servants before the campaign actually commenced. Presumably men receiving wages of peace were engaged in some military activity; those few paid wages of peace during the campaigning period must not have been actual participants in the campaign.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XIV

[1] Actual payment occurs in the Recepta Scaccarii (see pp. 19, 33).

[2] Entries are entered neither in the order of rates of wages nor according to when men commenced or ceased receiving them.

[3] However, Perton is called sergeant of the pantry in the Recepta Forinseca.

[4] However, see pp. 78, 89 n. 20.

[5] See Table V, p. 231.

[6] See pp. 232-33.

[7] See p. 234.

CHAPTER XV

PRESTITA ET REMANENCIA

The final tituli of expenses in the accounts are the Prestita (Prests) and Remanencia (Remainder). Gunthorpe and Ypres combine these expenses under the one heading Prestita et Remanencia.[1]

Prests, or imprests, could be sums advanced to a person, either because the money would become due to him or because it would permit him to perform some task, or prests could be sums owed to the wardrobe.[2] The recipient or debtor would have to account to the wardrobe for such sums at a future date. Therefore, prests in the Prestita were debts owed the household at the end of the accounting period. These debts constitute payments for which the household had not received satisfaction, either in services or kind.

The remainder is the value of wine, victuals, and other stores remaining in the possession of the king's butler and the heads of the household departments at the end of the accounting period. The Remanencia was an expense[3] because the victuals and stores had been paid for by the household, but, because they had not been consumed, their costs could not be recorded in the Hospicium expenses which included only the value of victuals and stores actually used. Neither Farley nor Beverley contain any remainder because both were terminal accounts; that is, the household organizations of both keepers were dissolved.

Although there are no successive wardrobe books, a study of the series of enrolled accounts reveals that certain items in the Prestita et Remanencia of one account became part of the Recepta Forinseca of the next account. With the exception of terminal accounts, the remainder of one account always became part of the foreign receipt of the next one. This is not surprising: the remainder consisted of foodstuffs and goods purchased by, and stored in, the household.

Some prests, such as those for money in the butler's possession, for war wages, or for advances to household officials for purveyances, appear in the foreign receipt.[4] This is somewhat confusing.

During the reign of Edward II and the early years of Edward III, a wardrobe keeper at the end of his keepership made a list of prests outstanding, and submitted this list with his account to the exchequer.[5] As was the case with debts owed by the household at the end of a keepership, the exchequer assumed the responsibility for collecting the amounts owed which the prests represented. If this practice was still being followed in the accounts under study, there should be no prests among the household's receipts. However, all accounts have prests in the Recepta Forinseca.

No marginal entries in the wardrobe books state that persons charged with prests settled with the exchequer for them.

The exchequer enrolled accounts show that many did.[6] If a prest is recorded in the Recepta Forinseca of any account, it is possible that the debtor discharged his debt at the household rather than at the exchequer. The keeper would have to account for the money, and recorded the receipt in his Recepta Forinseca.

The Remanencia expenses will be discussed first. The types of stores which formed the remainder and the offices in which they were found have been mentioned in the chapter on the Recepta Forinseca.[7] The remainder in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield make up some three-fifths of the total value of the prests and remainder. The single largest element of the remainder is the value of the wine in the butler's possession. This amounts to about £755, £630, and £1,980 in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield respectively. Most of the remainder in the household offices is found in the four offices of the spicery, the kitchen (larder in Wakefield's account), the hall and chamber, and the marshalsea (avenery in Gunthorpe's account). Of these four offices the first two have the largest remainder. In the accounts of Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Wakefield, the respective stores in the spicery amount to about £925, £570, and £450, and in the kitchen to about £590, £575, and £130. The stores in the hall and chamber and the marshalsea generally ranged between £100 and £200. The value of the remainder in the other offices is normally less than £10, although that of the poultry in

Gunthorpe's account is almost £95.

Prests are found in the Prestita of all five accounts. They total almost £6,900 in Farley's account, a large sum probably due to the war. In the other accounts, the value ranges from some £1,325 in Beverley's to about £1,700 in Ypres'. Household officials were charged with prests for either stores or money remaining in their offices at the end of the accounting period. Prests for stores represent the value of the commodities provided by an official but for which he had not presented an account. For example, in Farley's account, John de Newbury, clerk of the great wardrobe, was charged with a prest of £536 8s. 3/4d. for things remaining in his office, while John de Stodey, butler, was charged with a prest of £340 10s.2d. for wine remaining in his possession.

Prests could also be for the value of goods received by a non-household royal official from the king's butler or the household, stores for which the recipient had not accounted. In Farley's account, almost a third of the total value of prests resulted from wines received by such officials from John de Stodey, king's butler. Thus, Roger de Bromly, keeper of the victuals in Honfleur, John de Middleton, keeper of the victuals in Calais, and Richard Charles, Philippa's butler,[8] were charged with prests totalling some £2,800. In Wakefield's account, William de Rednesse, keeper of the victuals in Calais, was charged with a prest of almost £1,090 for the victuals and wine received from the household and the king's butler. This amounts to well over half of Wakefield's total prests.

Prests could also represent short deliveries; that is, the wardrobe had paid more money to an officials's account than the value of victuals provided or services performed and was charged with a prest for the difference. For example, in Wakefield's account Adam de Hull, purveyor of the household, was charged with a prest for the £66 13s.4d. remaining in his possession out of the £492 provided him for the purveyance of salmon. The same account records a prest charged against a non-household servant. John Baddyng, mariner, was charged with a prest for the £13 remaining from the £60 he received for cider for the king's sea voyage. In Beverley's account, John de Sleaford, clerk of the great wardrobe, was charged with a prest of £300, the money provided him on 28 June and 1 July 1377 to buy black cloth for Edward's funeral.[9] Wakefield records an advance given so that a servant could perform a task. The Recepta Scaccarii shows that on 1 January 1373 Richard Penycombe, yeoman, received £6 13s.4d. against his expenses in going to Flanders to buy horses. The sum was charged as a prest against Penycombe.

Gunthorpe, Ypres, and Beverley show that the butler was charged with money remaining in his office. This type is the only one in Gunthorpe's account. They range in value from some £1,525, almost the entire value of prests in Ypres' account, to only £300 in Beverley's, undoubtedly because this was a terminal account. These prests generally became part of the foreign receipt of the next account. For example, the money in the possession of the butler in Gunthorpe's account is shown in the exchequer enrollment to have been part of foreign receipt of his missing next account[10] (1 February 1367 to 12 February 1368).

At their accounting with the wardrobe some persons were found in arrears, and the sums owed the wardrobe were charged against them as prests. For example, Ypres shows that John Legge, purveyor, owed £25 15d. and John Watford, yeoman of the larder, 67s. 1/2d. Many arrears deal with money obtained from the third penny[11] for the purchase of oxen and lamb for the great kitchen. One purveyor appears in several accounts. John de Conyngesby, sergeant, owed £47 12s.6d. in Ypres' account, while in Wakefield's he was unable to account for £493 6s.8d. out of the £1,298 10s.1d. he had received.[12]

Beverley's account contains another sort of arrears. Charged as prests against Geoffrey Newton, butler, are the values of wine issues disallowed at the exchequer audit. The _Necessaria_ reveals that three casks of Gascon wine valued at £17 17s. 6d. were burned with the galleys in Weymouth,[13] and the _Dona_ shows that the butler issued wine valued at nearly £88 to various persons, including the king's son Thomas of Woodstock, earl of Cambridge, his daughter Isabella, countess of Bedford, and his mistress Alice Perrers.[14] These expenditures were disallowed, but the onus of accounting for them was assumed by Newton, not Beverley, because they were charged as prests against the butler.

The same account shows that some prests were disallowed because the warrants for the original disbursements were defective. Who then became responsible for the expenses is not stated. Disallowed were three prests, totalling some £26, for 20,000 billets of firewood stored in Porchester Castle, 360 quarters of charcoal "for the king's voyage across the sea"[15] stored in the house next to the same castle, and for 200 quarters of charcoal purchased for the same voyage remaining at Shotley, near Orwell.

Wakefield's account contains two prests, totalling £71, charged against Thomas de Orgrave which were crossed out because it was found that both of the prests were for sums allowed to Orgrave in the _Dona_ of the first year of the account. The two prests apparently were entered because Orgrave's name was omitted in the _Dona_. In the first _Dona_ entry, Orgrave (unnamed) received money for the wages of men-at-arms and archers living on ships at Southampton awaiting the arrival of the king of Navarre; the second reveals that Orgrave (unnamed) received money for the butler and hunter of the duke of Guelders who presented Edward with Rhenish wine on the duke's behalf.[16]

Money that actually had not been received might be listed in the _Recepta Forinseca_ as receipts. In such cases, the amount was charged as a prest against the person who should have given it to the household but had not done so. Thus, in

Farley's account, the £40 the household should have received from the ransom of the church of Vescy in Rheims by the hands of the lord Thomas de Dale[17] was charged as a prest against Dale. In Ypres' account, the value of plate lost by six household officers was listed as a foreign receipt. Only one man actually made restitution since the value of the missing plate was charged as prests against the other five. One of these five men, Walter de Wyght, sergeant of the pantry, was charged with a prest of 8s.10 1/2d. for lost plate. In some cases, money listed as received in the Recepta Scaccarii also had not been received by the household. When this was the case, that sum was charged as a prest against the person who had received the money on the household's behalf. The most significant example comes from Farley's account. Henry Picard received the sum of £2,000 from the exchequer, a sum still outstanding at his accounting with the wardrobe.[18]

Farley's is the only account to list prests pertaining to wages. They amount to about one-sixth of the value of Farley's prests. Generally such prests arose from overpayments discovered when individuals accounted for their wages with the wardrobe, but foreign mercenaries apparently could be charged with prests for advances on wages for which no accounting had been rendered.[19] Many wages are apparently war wages. In no instance do the various sums involved balance. For example, the war wages of Richard fitz Alan, earl of Arundel, amount to £452 12s.7d. He had received an advance of £661 17s.10d. on his war wages; £209 4s.1d. remained in his possession and was charged against him as a prest. The war wages of lord Frederick van Peghwencle, a continental mercenary, totalled £161 3s. He had received £33 6s.8d. from the exchequer as a prest against his fees.[20] In the Prestita he was charged not only with a prest for the money he had received from the exchequer but also for £30 which he had received as a prest from the keeper.[21] Household servants were also charged with prests for wages. For example, John Elleford was entitled to robes worth 40s. and war wages totalling £48 11s. Elleford received £51 16s.6d. from the exchequer, and the difference, 16s.8d., was charged against him as a prest. A few household members mentioned in Farley's Prestita do not appear in the Vadia Guerre. For instance, Richard Verius, who received robes and footwear valued at 14s.8d., was charged with a prest for 26s.8d., perhaps an advance on his regular wages.

Finally, Farley's and Beverley's accounts contain some prests for which little or nor information is given. Beverley has one such example. Edward's son Thomas was charged with a prest of £8 13s.4d., money which he had received on two occasions by the hands of his yeoman John Redyng. Farley's account contains several such prests. For example, John de Morle, who does not appear elsewhere in the account, was charged with a prest of 65s. for money remaining his his possession.

The prests and remainder were expenses. Prests were debts owed to the wardrobe either because the person had received too much money or because he could not account for all the money received. The remainder was an expense in that it records the value of unused victuals and other stores remaining in the household at the end of the accounting period. The remainder could not be part of the Hospicium expenses, since that section gives only the value of victuals and stores actually consumed.

In those accounts containing both prests and remainder, the value of the remainder is always greater than that of the prests. The most valuable prests are those charged against the butler for money in his possession and those charged against royal servants, especially the keepers of the victuals in Calais, for the value of victuals and wine received from the household and the king's butler.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XV

[1] The expenses are: Farley - prests - £6,897 15s.8d.; Gunthorpe - £4,133 11s.3 1/2d. (prests - £1,476 18s.7 1/2d.; remainder - £2,656 12s.8d.); Ypres - £3,994 14s.1 1/4d. (prests - £1,694 2s.4 1/4d.; remainder - £2,300 9s.5d.); Wakefield - £4,518 8s.10d. (prests - £1,680 7d.; remainder - £2,838 8s.3d.); and Beverley - prests - £1,325 7s.3d.

[2] For prests see Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward II", pp. 95-97; Johnson,"Wardrobe of Edward I", p. 54; and Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 234.

[3] Tout (Chapters, IV, pp. 164-65 n.2) questions the inclusion of the Remanencia among the expenses.

[4] See pp. 42-43.

[5] Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward II", pp. 96-97, and "Wardrobe and Household", p. 234.

[6] See p. 253 and n. 10 below.

[7] See pp. 41-42.

[8] See p. 60.

[9] See p. 111.

[10] P.R.O. E 361/4/11. The enrollment of Gunthorpe's surviving wardrobe book (P.R.O. E 361/4/10) shows that he accounted for this sum at the exchequer in 42 Edward III (25 January 1368 to 24 January 1369).

[11] See p. 149 n. 31.

[12] Conyngesby's position seems to have worsened since Gunthorpe's account, when he was forgiven the £276 18s.11d. he was in arrears, a gift which was, however, disallowed at the exchequer audit (see pp. 145-46).

[13] See p. 142.

[14] See pp. 202, 204 n. 16.

[15] Presumably his unsuccessful attempt to relieve La Rochelle in 1372.

[16] See pp. 191, 197.

[17] See p. 50.

[18] See p. 39 n. 36.

[19] One can only assume that foreign mercenaries ensured either complete payment of all wages owed them or obtained some form of recognition of wages outstanding (see p. 61) before they left Edward's service. If mercenaries had received advances on wages and left before they had earned the full value of that advance, the household or exchequer presumably had no chance of collecting the overpayments.

[20] See p. 32.

[21] Mercenaries seem normally to have been paid by the keeper of the wardrobe (see pp. 32-33).

CHAPTER XVI

VESSELLAMENTA

The final section included by Farley, Gunthorpe, and Ypres is an inventory of valuables, mostly plate, in the household's possession during the accounting period. The inventory is entitled Jocalia (Jewelry) in Farley's account, despite the fact that no jewelry is listed, and Vessellamenta recepti de Willelmo de Manton' (Plate Received from William de Manton)[1] in Gunthorpe's. Ypres gives no title. These inventories recorded the number, type, description, and value of the valuables. The value of plate is expressed in terms of goldsmith's weight (pondus aurifabrie or librum Jocalium), not in actual monetary value.[2]

Generally, the plate listed is of silver, either sterling or gilt, although some plate made of gold is also mentioned. The most common types of plate include candelabra (although none appear in Farley), spoons, saltcellars, dishes, platters, plates, chafing dishes, cooking pots, drinking pots, goblets, ewers, basins, and wash basins. The accounts of Gunthorpe and Ypres, which record the names of the departments in possession of pieces of plate, reveal that, in general, candelabra and spoons were found in the pantry; drinking pots and goblets in the buttery; dishes, platters, chafing dishes, and cooking pots in the scullery; saltcellars and dishes in the saucery; basins, wash basins, and ewers in the ewery; and plates and dishes in the spicery and the apothecary's office. A large dish and a drinking pot were kept in the almonry. However, most of the household plate was kept in the buttery, scullery, and ewery. Apparently, the household kept no more plate than was required for everyday use, since the Necessaria[3] indicates that plate for feasts had to be fetched from London.

In addition to plate in its ordinary forms, Farley mentions a number of silver bottles or flasks, two goblets of glass garnished with gold, and a plate of jasper garnished with precious stones and pearls. Miscellaneous items such as skewers, ladles, skimmers, a funnel, and a flesh-hook also occur in various accounts; Farley's lists a brass balance and weights "for small things".

Farley's and Ypres' accounts also refer to other valuable items. Ypres notes that the household had custody of two diapered cloths of gold, each with a gold falcon on a red field, and another two diapered cloths of gold, each with a gold lion on an indigo field. No value is given. Farley's inventory lists three old cloths of rayed kersey valued at £4 and various items in the possession of the deacon of Edward's chapel. These include two portable breviaries, two missals, and a service book, all of the Sarum use; a cushion of silk; two cases, one containing corporal cloth of silk and the other corporal cloth of embroidered samite; an altar cloth; a portable stone altar; and a sterling silver chalice and censer.

None of these are valued. An osculatory[4] of sterling silver weighed 28s.

The accounts of Gunthorpe and Ypres contain subheadings indicating what plate was in the household at the beginning of the accounting period, what was added during that time, and what department had possession of pieces of plate. All three accounts have marginal notations indicating what plate was lost or otherwise disposed of during the period of account. Thus, the plate in the household at the end of the accounting period can readily be determined.

Plate in the household at the beginning of the period of account was that plate in the household's possession at the end of the previous accounting period. The inventories were based upon previous lists or indentures between the wardrobe keeper and department heads. For example, Ypres' inventory has a subheading entitled Vessellamenta de novo facti anno primo Brantyngham, which refers to plate newly-made in the previous accounting period. Plate in the household at the beginning of Gunthorpe's and Ypres' periods of account is recorded under department headings, according to which office had custody of pieces of plate. Without actually providing any headings, Farley's account seems to follow the same procedure because various types of plate, such as basins, wash basins, and ewers, are generally grouped together.

Following the inventories of plate in the household at the beginning of the accounting period, Gunthorpe and Ypres record plate, either new or used, acquired during the course of the account. Only Gunthorpe records what departments became responsible for the plate, and then only for most of the new plate. The costs of new plate are recorded in the Necessaria of the accounts. For example, in Gunthorpe's account the household received plate from William de Sleaford, clerk of the king's works,[5] Helming Leget, receiver of the king's chamber,[6] and Thomas de Hassey, king's goldsmith and citizen of London.[7] The plate received from Sleaford presumably was not new, but had been kept by him in safe keeping until needed. That received from Leget and Hassey was either repaired or new. The inventory records that two drinking pots, one goblet with a cover, and one ewer, all of pure gold, were received from them. The Necessaria shows that Leget had delivered the two pots to Hassey for repair, and that pure gold weighing 118s.2 1/2d. was used for this purpose. After repair the pots weighed £25 16s.6 1/2d., the same weight recorded in the inventory. The same item in the Necessaria says that Hassey made the goblet and cover, weighing £32 5d., and the ewer, weighing 35s. The cost of the gold used, and the expense of repairing and making the plate, amounted to £614. The Recepta Scaccarii[8] indicates that Hassey was paid by Leget "from the money of the king's chamber" on 22 October 1366. The account does not state what department became responsible for the gold plate, but perhaps it went to the chamber since that department paid for it.

Ypres also lists plate obtained during the accounting period. For example, the inventory shows that 24 sterling silver dishes, stamped inside the borders with the quartered arms of England and France and weighing £31 12s.8d., were made during the period of account. The Necessaria[9] reveals that the weight of the plate equalled £41 2s.5d. in money. Making and stamping the dishes cost another £5 12s. Thus, making the dishes cost 79s. (at 2s.6d. per pound of weight), stamping cost 12s. (at 6d. each), and 21s. (at 8d. per pound) was lost in pouring the dishes. The Necessaria reveals that this money was paid to Joan de Hassey, while the inventory describes the dishes as "newly made by the wife of Thomas de Hassey" (de novo facti per uxorem Thome de Hassey).[10] Used plate in Ypres' account was received from various persons, including the clerk of the king's works in Westminster and the Tower, the keeper of the great wardrobe, and the executors of the testaments of the countess of Huntingdon and Thomas Cheyne. Some plate received from the countess's executors is specifically described as old. The costs of the plate received from Cheyne's executors appear in the Vessellamenta Argenti.[11]

While Farley's inventory has no subheadings, many of the descriptions of plate provide information about where the household obtained plate. For example, one description says that 24 new silver goblets weighing £23 10s.10d. were received from the cofferer; another entry states that 36 saltcellars weighing £12 5s.4d. were made by the order of the exchequer.

All three inventories contain marginal notations which explain how the household disposed of the plate in question. Every piece of plate in the inventories of Farley's and Ypres' accounts is the subject of a marginal notation; this is the case only for a few pieces of plate in Gunthorpe's.

Marginal entries indicate that pieces of plate were lost by household servants. Restitution resulted in receipts which were recorded in the *Recepta Forinseca*.[12] For example, Farley's *Jocalia* reveals that 3 sterling silver goblets were lost by Thomas de Mussenden, sergeant of the buttery. These goblets were valued at 54s.6d., the same sum received from him in the *Recepta Forinseca*. In Gunthorpe's account, William de Notyngham lost a small sterling silver dish weighing 39s.2d., equal to 50s.11d. in money. No restitution was required since he was forgiven the loss.[13]

Both Gunthorpe's and Ypres' accounts reveal that plate was sold to the goldsmith Thomas de Hassey. For example, Gunthorpe records that a large sterling silver dish for entremets, which weighed 48s.5d. new and 47s.11d. used, was sold to Hassey. This dish is among the various pieces, weighing £76 14s.1 1/2d., listed in the *Recepta Forinseca*[14] as sold to Hassey for the sum of £99 14s.4 1/2d. Ypres has no such receipts in his *Recepta Forinseca* since all such sales took place in the previous accounting period. However, the *Recepta Scaccarii* does reveal that unspecified old silver plate weighing £30 8s. was sold to Joan de Hassey, resulting in a receipt of £39 10s.4 1/2d.[15]

No reason is given for selling plate except when it seems to have been used by the goldsmith for new plate. However, the difference between the weights of plate when new and when used suggests that plate was sold because it was old and worn. In addition, Ypres states that Hassey bought parts of two broken silver dishes, weighing 27s.11d., which had been recovered "after the hanging of a page of Roger Janyn".

One marginal entry in Ypres' account states that plate was repaired. A description of a one-gallon sterling silver drinking pot stamped with a rose states that it weighed 117s. 3d. However, a marginal note says that this drinking pot was delivered to Thomas de Hassey for repair, weighing 116s.8d. before repair and £6 8d. afterwards. Farley also mentions repairs, but makes this part of the description. Thus, one wash basin weighing 57s.10d. is described merely as having been repaired.

Marginal notations against the inventories show what happened to plate when the keepership changed hands or some circumstances reduced the amount of plate in the keeper's charge. Ypres shows that plate in his charge not sold or lost was delivered by indenture either to William de Sleaford, presumably to be stored, or to Henry de Wakefield, the man who became keeper at the end of Ypres' accounting period. The plate received by Wakefield was undoubtedly that which remained in the household. Gunthorpe has several marginal entries which state that plate was delivered to William de Sleaford. However, most of the plate has no notation, probably because it remained in the household of which Gunthorpe continued as keeper.

All the plate in Farley's Jocalia is the subject of undated marginal entries which indicates that some of the plate was delivered during Farley's keepership to William de Ferriby, keeper of the wardrobe which became responsible for expenses in England on 26 May 1360, some to William de Lambhith, clerk of the king's works,[16] for storage, some to William de Berkyng, a London goldsmith,[17] and some to several household servants, although these servants received very little plate. Ferriby received only about a quarter of the value of plate listed, while Lambhith received somewhat less than half, and Berkyng about a fifth. The plate delivered to Berkyng is not described as sold to him and no revenues from him are recorded in the account. In addition to plate delivered to others, marginal entries state that a small amount "remained" in the possession of Farley, the keeper, the deacon of Edward's chapel, and another household servant. Plate retained by the latter was negligible; the valuables retained by the deacon are mentioned above.[18] The fact that plate is described as remaining in his possession indicates that Farley was still keeper when most of the plate was removed from his custody. This would suggest that plate was transferred to Ferriby's establishment when it was created and that Farley retained only a negligible portion for his small household in France. However, Ferriby's household must have been rather small since he received but a quarter of the plate originally in Farley's custody. If that delivered to Berkyng was not sold to him, then most of the plate went into safe storage. The inventory does not say what became of the plate in Farley's possession when his keepership ended.

Although comparison is difficult because descriptions in Farley's account are not as complete or detailed as those in the other two,[19] a certain amount of plate is common to all three accounts. Only a small amount is common to Farley's and Gunthorpe's, but most of the plate in Gunthorpe's inventory also appears in Ypres'. This presumably results from the fact that in the interval between Farley and Gunthorpe there was a large drop in the total weight of plate in the household, while between Gunthorpe and Ypres there was an even larger gain.[20] It is not clear why Gunthorpe records less plate than the other two accounts, but perhaps the constant travelling during his period of account meant that less plate was required.

Both Farley and Gunthorpe list the same sterling silver cooking pot. In Farley's account it weighed £6 12s.6d., and is described as formerly belonging to the queen mother. Gunthorpe gives this as the original weight and also records a lesser weight, £6 7s.6d., which shows the pot was then worn and had depreciated in value. A silver gilt plate once belonging to the queen mother appears in all three inventories. It weighed £8 10s. in Farley's account, but £8 11s. in the others. Perhaps it was repaired. Both Gunthorpe's and Ypres' inventories reveal that the pantry had custody of a silver saltcellar weighing 30s.6d. An inventory of plate in the household at the end of Henry de Wakefield's keepership, which terminated on 13 October 1376,[21] lists a saltcellar weighing 42s.6d. This appears to be a new one made, in part, from the old. The Necessaria of the second year of Wakefield's account reveals that Hans Poperyng, a London goldsmith, made a saltcellar from an old broken silver gilt saltcellar weighing 30s.6d. Poperyng was paid 73s. for his work and for the silver used.

Farley's, Gunthorpe's, and Ypres' accounts contain inventories of plate in the household's possession during the accounting period. The latter two accounts generally indicate which departments had custody of the plate. Generally plate is described, and part of this description is its weight per pondus aurifabrie. Some of the plate appearing in successive inventories apparently became worn from constant use since the weights declined. However, in a few cases the weights increased, presumably because the plate had been repaired. By means of subheadings and/or marginal notations, it can be determined what plate was in the household at the beginning, what was added or removed, and, therefore, what remained at the end of the accounting period. Plate disposed of during the accounting period could be lost, sold to goldsmiths, or delivered to the clerk of the king's works in Westminster and the Tower for safe keeping. The plate in the household at the end of the accounting period was generally delivered to the next keeper, although Farley's account does not reveal what happened to the plate he held at the end of his keepership. His account reveals that some plate was transferred to William de Ferriby when a second household was established in England, while Farley himself retained a small amount of plate in France. These two establishments must have been relatively small since most of the plate originally in Farley's custody apparently went into storage.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

[1] Manton was the former keeper.

[2] See pp. 122-23, 124 n.2. While the *Vessellamenta Argenti* abbreviates the "£" as *lb*', the inventories use the customary *li*'. None of the inventories records the total weights of the plate listed, which are approximately as follows: Farley - £1,230; Gunthorpe - £895; and Ypres - £1,435. However, weights are not given for all the plate listed in Farley's account.

[3] See p. 133.

[4] An osculatory was a metal, ivory, or wooden tablet on which was a painted or carved image of Christ, the Virgin, or a saint, and which had a handle. It was the means by which the kiss of peace was conveyed from the celebrant to the people, as the priest first and then the members of the congregation kissed it in turn.

[5] Sleaford was clerk of the king's works at the palace of Westminster and the Tower of London from 14 November 1361 to 21 June 1377 [Howard M. Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works - The Middle Ages* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), vol. II, p. 1047]. The clerk of the king's works was the administrative official responsible for the maintenance, repair, and building of royal buildings. Plate may have been stored in the Tower or perhaps at Westminster where the clerk of the works had an office (*ibid*., vol. I, pp. 200-201). However, the latter seems more likely as several inventories of plate in the enrolled accounts describe Sleaford as the clerk of the king's palace at Westminster (see P.R.O. E 361/4/10r, 4/11r, and 5/17r). Sleaford was also keeper of the great wardrobe from 6 November 1371 to 21 June 1377 (Tout, *Chapters*, VI, p. 36) and keeper of the privy wardrobe from 20 January 1365 to 21 June 1377 (*ibid*., p. 37).

[6] Leget was receiver from 3 January 1362 to 25 September 1375 (Tout, *Chapters*, VI, p. 56).

[7] See p. 39 n. 25.

[8] See p. 28.

[9] See p. 136.

[10] F 25r. That a widow should assume her husband's position as master in a craft guild is well known (see Eileen E. Power, Medieval Women, ed. Michael M. Postan (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 55-56; and Margaret Greaves, "The London Subsidy of 1332", Note I, p. 59, in Finance and Trade Under Edward III, ed. George Unwin (London, Frank Cass and Co., 1918, reprinted 1962). Women goldsmiths are also attested (see Power, Medieval Women, p. 60, and Reddaway and Walker, Goldsmiths' Company, p. 288). Although not said to have inherited her husband's position as king's goldsmith, that Joan de Hassey should herself make plate for the king seems unusual and speaks highly of her skill. Two other women artisans are mentioned in the accounts (see pp. 27, 137).

[11] See Chapter VI.

[12] See p. 48.

[13] See p. 145.

[14] See p. 49.

[15] See p. 28.

[16] He was clerk of the works in Westminster and the Tower from 6 June 1356 to 14 November 1361 (King's Works, ed. Colvin, vol. II, p. 1047). The inventory of plate in the enrolled account of William de Manton for 14 November 1361 to 13 November 1362 describes him as "recently" clerk of the king's palace at Westminster (see P.R.O. E 361/4/7r).

[17] Berkyng was warden of the goldsmiths' company in 1349-50, 1351-52, 1354-55, and 1358-59 (Reddaway and Walker, Goldsmiths' Company, pp. 323-24).

[18] See pp. 261-62.

[19] On the other hand, Farley's descriptions are occasionally unique in giving both the weight and monetary value of a piece of plate. For example, two enamelled silver gilt basins with spouts weighed 8 marks, equal to £8 4s. in money.

[20] See n. 1 above.

[21] The inventory, an indenture between Wakefield and William de Moulsoe, successive wardrobe keepers, is published in Nicholas H. Nicolas, "Observations on the Origins and History of the Badge and Mottoes of Edward Prince of Wales", Archaeologia, vol. XXXI (1845), pp. 350-84.

CONCLUSION

A detailed study of the contents of the surviving wardrobe books for the period 1359 to 1377 illustrates the functioning of the king's household. The household was essentially responsible for providing food and shelter for the king and his court, but the chief officers of the household could, if the opportunity arose, be employed in affairs of state. Farley's account and to a lesser extent that of Wakefield show what the household might still be called upon to do when the king was personally involved with the war in France. While not recording the vast war wages found in Farley's account, the first year of Wakefield's lists the expenditure of £1,276 for the purchase of horses for war purposes. The physical task of gathering the horses illustrates the flexibility of the household organization.

Aside from the war effort, the intrusion of the household into national administration was slight. As Edward's personal interest in affairs of state and the war diminished, the household was left with only its domestic responsibilities. No longer did the chief household officers automatically become the chief administrators of the realm. Thus, the five wardrobe books include the household's last great involvement in national affairs, the Rheims campaign of 1359-60, a reminder of the former activity of the household, but show the household thereafter limited strictly to domestic matters, which were to remain its only concern after 1377.

The household handled large amounts of money. The five accounts show that the household's income amounted to approximately £250,515 and its expenditures some £1,300 more. Nearly all of the household's receipts came from the exchequer, whose financial supremacy was recognized by the wardrobe. It is possible that the household had a budget administered by the exchequer. A single entry in Wakefield's Recepta Scaccarii says that £200 had been ordered "for each week for the expenses of the said household". The sum of £200 per week, or £10,400 per year, was, however, inadequate for the complete needs of the household, especially in Farley's account. However, most of Farley's disbursements, which were related to the French war, cannot be considered normal household expenditures. Gunthorpe's accounting period, on the other hand, is relatively uneventful but the expenses still amount to almost £27,055.

It would appear, therefore, that the exchequer did not impose a budget upon the household organization. The accounts suggest that the exchequer never questioned any of the household's foreign expenses if they were properly documented. No documentation at all was required for Hospicium expenses. Even when Farley's household was acting as a war treasury, no exchequer clerks seem to have been with it to provide any sort of checks. If money was available, and properly requested, it seems to have been forthcoming. Nevertheless, Gunthorpe's account suggests, by the number of times the keeper was sent to the exchequer for money, that the household was often short of money. The impression is that occasionally the household lived a hand to mouth existence.

When preparing their accounts for the exchequer audit, the various keepers and their assistants employed what seem to have been generally accepted _tituli_ of receipts and expenses. The wardrobe books, however, are not identical in form and small variations seem not to have been questioned. For example, four of the five accounts have the _tituli_ _Vadia Venatorum_ and _Vadia Falconariorum_, but Farley has only the latter under which is recorded the wages of both hunters and falconers. Another variation is found in the recording of expenses concerning horses. Farley and Gunthorpe record such expenditures among their _Dona_ and _Necessaria_, whereas the accounts of Ypres, Wakefield, and Beverley have separate _tituli_ entitled _Empcio Equorum_ and _Restaurum Equorum_.

Some _tituli_ are unique to individual accounts. Ypres alone has the _Vessellamenta Argenti_, which records plate purchased from the executors of Thomas Cheyne. Only Farley contains the somewhat puzzling _titulus_ _Vadia Pacis_. Both seem to have been used as the result of exceptional circumstances.

If a new _titulus_ could be used for something out of the ordinary, an old one might be used for a new purpose indicating a change in household practices. Such seems to have been the case for the _Elemosina_.

All the accounts except that of Gunthorpe record that the king gave alms to paupers. During Farley's period of account meals were given to large numbers of paupers on special feast days. In the last three accounts such meals are not mentioned. Instead the king was granting daily alms of 3d. to paupers. In all three accounts, 14 unnamed paupers received alms of this nature. Daily alms were also granted named paupers; only 4 appear in Ypres' account, but 10 or 11 occur in the other two. Many of these named recipients appear to have been either former or active household members. The daily allowances granted such persons appear to be a form of pension, or perhaps supplementary wages. If this speculation is correct, the *Elemosina* was being used to record payments not really in keeping with the purpose of the *titulus*.

The decline in Edward's activities and needs during the last years of his life is reflected in reduced household expenses and a decreasing household staff. The daily average of the total household expenditures decreased from some £74 in Gunthorpe's account to some £55 in Beverley's. The size of the household staff contracted from about 500 regular members in Farley's account to about 350 in that of Beverley. The staff shows a surprising continuity over the five accounts, even if advancement within the household ranks was neither frequent nor rapid. The king seems to have looked after his staff, particularly if he did provide them with pensions or supplementary wages from his alms. He was lenient in some matters, such as the accidental loss of plate, but one household servant was hanged for stealing plate. The accounts record some gifts by the king to the staff.

While it is possible to estimate the approximate size of the household from the accounts, no impression can be obtained of life in that household. The _Hospicium_ expenses, which could have provided such information, cannot be used because no details beyond the daily sums are given. Even the daily location of the household cannot be used to determine the king's itinerary because the foreign expenses reveal that Edward was often absent from the household. If court life was one of splendour, the only notion of that splendour comes from the more impressive pieces of household plate, some of gold, found in the inventories. However, such pieces of plate were probably used on very few occasions, since the accounts reveal that plate had to be brought out of storage when needed.

Aside from those dealing with the war in France, expenditures recorded in the five accounts generally resulted from the everyday running of the household. Few expenses recorded in the accounts pertain directly to the activities or interests of the king. In general, only the _Elemosina_ and the _Dona_ reveal anything of a personal nature, and very little at that.

The _Elemosina_ suggest that Edward was conventionally pious, that he attended daily masses, and that he celebrated the great feasts of the church. On such feasts he granted special alms or oblations. The king went upon the occasional pilgrimage to Canterbury, where he visited such places as the shrines of Becket and St. Augustine. On the continent Edward also made offerings at shrines.

One of the more interesting religious practices revealed by the accounts is the infixing of coins in candles on Candlemas, a rather odd form of alms-giving which seems not to be noted elsewhere. The accounts also refer to the making of cramp rings from royal offerings on Good Friday and to cloths and shoes used on Maundy Thursday.

The king gave alms of wine to religious houses for the celebration of the mass, favouring houses of the Dominican order. The Dona reveal that Edward granted gifts of wine for anniversary masses, such as those for his mother, queen Isabella, and his wife, queen Philippa.

The Dona provides some information about the kings' travels and about some of the gifts he received. The titulus records payments to ferryboat operators and boatmen for transporting the king and his familia across rivers or upon rivers.

It is known that Edward was an avid hunter but only Gunthorpe's account indicates that he went on a hunting expedition. One entry in his Vadia Venatorum and many in his Dona reveal that Edward went hunting. Gunthorpe's Dona generally shows that Edward was still physically active during this accounting period. Later accounts suggest from their lack of expenses involving royal travel that Edward was becoming more and more sedentary, probably because of failing health.

The Nuncii of the first year of Wakefield's account suggests a serious illness of the king in August of 1371, with men being sent to fetch physicians and to offer wax in the king's name at religious houses. The cost of medicines purchased for the king, and others, appears in the Necessaria.

Just as few impressions of the king emerge in the accounts studied, little can be discovered about others with whom we know Edward was closely associated. Although the household of Philippa, his wife, was joined to Edward's in two of the accounts, the queen seldom appears in these accounts. She went to some religious services with the king, he gave her gifts of food and, on one occasion, he gave her a charger called "Blanchard Kyng".

Thomas of Woodstock, the king's youngest son, as a minor was part of the royal household. His retinue took part in the Rheims campaign although he, himself, received no wages, presumably because of his youth. On one occasion he received money from the household but for what reason is not stated. He seldom appears in the accounts, usually in the records of religious services where alms and oblations were given.

The king's grandson, Richard of Bordeaux, and his eventual heir, is mentioned only as attending the final feast of St. George celebrated by the king. Despite her reputed control over the old king in his dotage, the infamous Alice

Perrers is mentioned only in the accounts of Gunthorpe, Wakefield, and Beverley in connection with gifts of wine of a value no greater than that given to many others. Alice's illegitimate son by the king, John,[1] appears nowhere in the accounts.

The importance of this study, however, does not lie in the information that it gives about the king, his activities, and his family. In general, the accounts are silent about some matters; instead, they record the receipts and expenses necessitated by the running of a domestic organization. The contribution made by this work lies in the knowledge gained of the functioning of the royal household by a minute examination of the contents of the various tituli of the five household accounts.

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

[1] See Margaret Galway, "Alice Perrers' Son John", English Historical Review, vol. LXVI (1951), pp. 242-46.

WORKS CITED

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

a. Unpublished

Public Record Office, London:

E 101/393/11 (Exchequer Accounts, Various)

E 101/396/2 (Exchequer Accounts, Various)

E 101/396/11 (Exchequer Accounts, Various)

E 101/397/5 (Exchequer Accounts, Various)

E 101/398/9 (Exchequer Accounts, Various)

E 361/4 (Exchequer Enrolled Accounts [Pipe Office]: Wardrobe and Household Accounts)

E 361/5 (Exchequer Enrolled Accounts [Pipe Office]: Wardrobe and Household Accounts)

b. Published

Blackley, Frank D., and Hermansen, Gustav, eds. The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II (8 July 1311 to 7 July 1312). Edmonton (University of Alberta Press), 1971.

Burtt, Joseph, ed. "Account of the Expenses of John of Brabant and Thomas and Henry of Lancaster, 1292-3". Camden Society, old ser., vol. LV (1853) (Camden Miscellany, vol. II).

Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, vol. VIII (1348-1350), XI (1358-1361), and XVI (1374-1377). London (His Majesty's Stationery Office), 1905, 1911, 1916.

Chronicon Angliae, ab Anno Domini 1328 Usque ad Annum 1388, Auctore Monacho Quodam Sancti Albani, ed. Edward M. Thompson. London (Rolls Series), 1874.

Crow, Martin M., and Olson, Clair C., eds. Chaucer Life-Records. Austin (University of Texas Press), 1966.

Furnivall, Frederick J., ed. King Edward II's Household and Wardrobe Ordinances, A.D. 1323 in Life-Records of Chaucer, 2nd ser., vol. XIV. London (Chaucer Society), 1876.

Hart, Richard, ed. Ecclesiastical Records of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the Fifth Century till the Reformation. 2nd ed., Cambridge (MacMillan, Barclay, MacMillan), 1846.

Johnstone, Hilda. "The Wardrobe and Household of Henry, Son of Edward I". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. VII (1923), pp. 384-420.

Myers, Alec R., ed. "The Captivity of a Witch: The Household Accounts of Queen Joan of Navarre, 1419-21". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. XXIV (1940), pp. 263-84, and XXVI (1941-42), pp. 82-100.

________. The Household of Edward IV - The Black Book and the Ordinance of 1478. Manchester (Manchester University Press), 1959.

________. "The Household of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, 1466-7". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. L (1967-68), pp. 207-35, 443-81.

________. "The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou, 1452-3". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vol. XL (1957-58), pp. 79-113, 391-431.

Nicolas, Nicholas H. "Observations on the Origins and History of the Badge and Mottoes of Edward Prince of Wales". Archaeologia, vol. XXXI (1845), pp. 350-384.

Safford, E.W. "An Account of the Expenses of Eleanor, Sister of Edward III, on the Occasion of Her Marriage to Reynald, Count of Guelders". Archaeologia, vol. LXXVII (1927), pp. 111-40.

Webb, John, ed. "A Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, During Part of the Years 1289 and 1290". Camden Society, vol. LIX (1854) and LXII (1855).

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Attawater, Donald, ed. A Catholic Dictionary. 3rd ed., New York (Macmillan), 1961.

Bray, William. "An Account of the Obsolete Office of Purveyor to the King's Household". Archaeologia, vol. VIII (1787), pp. 329-62.

Barnes, Joshua. *A History of King Edward the Third*. Cambridge, 1688.

Burne, Alfred H. *The Crecy War - A Military History of the Hundred Years War from 1337 to the Peace of Bretigny, 1360*. London (Eyre and Spottiswoode), 1955.

Cokayne, George E., and Gibbs, Vicary, eds. *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*. 13 vols., London (St. Catherine Press), 1910-40.

Colvin, Howard M., ed. *The History of the King's Works - The Middle Ages*. 2 vols., London (Her Majesty's Stationery Office), 1963.

Crawfurd, Raymond. "The Blessing of Cramp-Rings - A Chapter in the History of the Treatment of Epilepsy". *Studies in the History and Method of Science*, ed. Charles Singer. Oxford (Clarendon Press), 1917, pp. 165-87.

Du Cange, Charles du Fresne, Sieur. *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, ed. D.P. Carpenter and G.A.L. Henschel. 7 vols., Paris, 1840-50.

Fowler, Kenneth. *The King's Lieutenant - Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster, 1310-1361*. New York (Barnes and Noble), 1969.

Galway, Margaret. "Alice Perrers' Son John". *English Historical Review*, vol. LXVI (1951), pp. 242-46.

Giesey, Ralph E. *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*. Genève (Librairie E. Droz), 1960.

Graves, Margaret. "The London Subsidy of 1332". *Finance and Trade Under Edward III*, ed. George Unwin. 1918; rpt. London (Frank Cass), 1962.

Harriss, Gerald L. *King, Parliament, and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369*. Oxford (Clarendon Press), 1975.

Hewitt, Herbert J. *The Organization of War Under Edward III, 1338-1362*. Manchester (Manchester University Press), 1966.

Hill, Mary C. *The King's Messengers, 1199-1377 - A Contribution to the History of the Royal Household*. London (Edward Arnold), 1961.

Hope, William H.St. John. "On the Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England, with special reference to those in the Abbey Church of Westminster". *Archaeologia*, vol. LX (1907), pt. II, pp. 517-70.

Howgrave-Graham, R.P. "The Earlier Royal Funeral Effigies - New Light on Portraiture in Westminster Abbey". Archaeologia, vol. XCVIII (1961), pp. 159-69.

Jenkinson, Charles H. "Exchequer Tallies". Archaeologia, vol. LXII (1910-11), pp. 367-80.

Johnson, Charles. "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward I". Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th ser., vol. VI (1923), pp. 50-72.

Johnson, J.H. "The King's Wardrobe and Household". The English Government at Work, 1327-1336: Volume I - Central and Prerogative Administration, ed. James F. Willard and William A. Morris. Cambridge, Mass. (Mediaeval Academy of America), 1940, pp. 206-49.

________. "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward II". Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th ser., vol. XII (1929), pp. 75-104.

Johnson, Paul. The Life and Times of Edward III. London (Weidenfeld and Nicolson), 1973.

Johnstone, Hilda. "A Year in the Life of King Henry III". Church Quarterly Review, vol. XCVII (1923-24), pp. 314-33.

Jones, W.R. "The Court of the Verge: The Jurisdiction of the Steward and Marshal of the Household in Later Medieval England". Journal of British Studies, vol. X no. 1 (1970), pp. 1-29.

Karraker, Cyrus H. "Royal Fish". Quarterly Review. vol. CCLXVII (1936), pp. 129-37.

Kay, Frederick G. Lady of the Sun - The Life and Times of Alice Perrers. London (Frederick Muller), 1966.

Labarge, Margaret W. A Baronial Household of the Thirteenth Century. London (Eyre and Spottiswoode), 1965.

________. "Eleanor de Montfort's Household Rolls". History Today, vol. XI (1961), pp. 490-500.

________. "The Spice Account: From Eleanor de Montfort's Household Rolls". History Today, vol. XV (1965), pp. 29-38.

Latham, Ronald E. Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources. London (British Academy), 1965.

Le Neve, John. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541; I - Lincoln Diocese*, compiled by H.P.F. King. London (Institute of Historical Research), 1962.

________. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541; VI - Northern Province (York, Carlisle and Durham)*, compiled by B. Jones. London (Institute of Historical Research), 1963.

________. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541; IX - Exeter Diocese*, compiled by Joyce M. Horn. London (Institute of Historical Research), 1964.

Le Patourel, John. "The Treaty of Brétigny, 1360". *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., vol. X (1960), pp. 19-39.

Neilson, Nellie. "The Forests". *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336: Volume I - Central and Prerogative Administration*, ed. James F. Willard and William A. Morris. Cambridge, Mass., (Mediaeval Academy of America), 1940, pp. 394-467.

Power, Eileen E. *Medieval Women*, ed. Michael M. Postan. Cambridge (Cambridge University Press), 1975.

Powicke, Frederick M., and Fryde, E.B., eds. *Handbook of British Chronology*. 2nd ed., London (Royal Historical Society), 1961.

Prince, Albert E. "The Indenture System Under Edward III". *Historical Essays in Honor of James Tait*, ed. John G. Edwards, Vivian H. Galbraith, and Ernest F. Jacob. Manchester, 1933, pp. 283-97.

________. "The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III's Reign". *Speculum*, vol. XIX (1944), pp. 137-60.

Purvis, John S. *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Terms*. Edinburgh (Thomas Nelson), 1962.

Reddaway, Thomas F., and Walker, Lorna E.M. *The Early History of the Goldsmiths' Company, 1327-1509*. London (Edward Arnold), 1975.

Richardson, Henry G. "The Exchequer Year". *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., vol. VIII (1925), pp. 171-90, and IX (1926), pp. 175-76.

Robinson, Chalfant. "Royal Purveyance in Fourteenth-Century England in Light of Simon of Islip's *Speculum Regis*". *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1910*, pp. 91-99.

Round, John H. The King's Serjeantries and Officers of State With Their Coronation Services. 1911; rpt. New York (Barnes and Noble), 1970.

Salzman, L.F. Edward I. London (Constable), 1968.

Steel, Antony. The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1377-1485. Cambridge (Cambridge University Press), 1954.

Tout, Thomas F. Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England, 6 vols. 1920-33; rpt. New York (Barnes and Noble), 1967.

________. The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History. Manchester (Manchester University Press), 1914.

Uffelmann, Doris L. "A Great Lady and Her Travels in the Thirteenth Century". Church Quarterly Review, vol. XCIX (1925), pp. 218-30.

Willard, James F. "The Observance of Holidays and Vacations by the Lower Exchequer, 1327-1336". University of Colorado Studies, vol. XXII (1934-35), pp. 281-87.

________. Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property, 1290-1334. Cambridge, Mass. (Mediaeval Academy of America), 1934.

Unpublished Papers, Theses and Dissertations

Colton, Agnes L., ed. "Wardrobe Account of Edward III, November 25, 1341, to April 10, 1344, Preserved in the Public Record Office, Miscellaneous Books of the Exchequer N. 204. Text, Notes and Introduction", Ph.D. thesis. Seattle (University of Washington), 1939.

Nielsen, John A., ed. "The Wardrobe Account of Richard of Beverley for the Fifty-First Year of the Reign of King Edward III of England", M.A. thesis. Edmonton (University of Alberta), 1968.

APPENDIX I

THE DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE VARIOUS HOUSEHOLD DEPARTMENTS

The departments of the royal household can be separated into those which dealt only with domestic functions and that department (the wardrobe) which had more complex duties. Departments concerned with the internal aspects of the household can be subdivided into those which fed the court and those which arranged for its travel and lodgings, plus a few other offices.

The feeding of the court was the responsibility of the departments of the pantry, buttery, and kitchen, with their subordinate offices.[1] The pantry and the buttery had a common head, but nevertheless accounted separately for their receipts and expenses. The pantry received, stored, and distributed all the bread required by the household, while the bakery, a subordinate office, made various grades of bread, and a waferer made wafers. The buttery provided all the wine and ale needed by the household, and also furnished and stored the various cups and vessels required for serving the wine and ale. Responsible for the meals were the kitchen and its subordinate offices of larder, poultry, scullery, and saucery. The kitchen cooked the meats, fish, and poultry, and prepared the various courses of the meals. One part of the kitchen prepared the roasts while another part, called the great kitchen, prepared "great" meat, that is, meat of large animals which was boiled.[2] The kitchen staff was further divided into those who cooked for the king and those who cooked for the household staff. The meat and fish used by the kitchen was stored in the larder. Poultry and eggs were purchased and stored by the office of the poultry. Wood, coal, and vessels used by the kitchen were obtained by the scullery. The saucery purchased flour and other things necessary for the making of sauces.

The department of the spicery supplied goods used in both the feeding and lodging of the court. It was possibly attached to the wardrobe.[3] This department received and stored non-perishable commodities, such as wax, cloth, and spices from the great wardrobe[4] stationed in the Tower of London, and in turn dispensed them to other household offices as needed. The spicery also obtained the fruit used by the household. Candles were made by the chandlery, a section of the spicery.

The lodging of the household and the serving of meals was the task of the department of the hall and chamber.[5] The king and his immediate entourage lodged and ate in the chamber; the rest of the staff ate and slept in the hall. Lower ranking servants had both the privilege and obligation of eating in the hall. Some high ranking officers were allowed their own chambers, and were granted a certain daily allowance for their maintenance, but the expenses of these private chambers were charged to the hall. Although four of the accounts under discussion combine the expenses of the hall and chamber,[6] each office had a separate staff[7] to perform the tasks of preparing beds, providing fuel and litter, ensuring the proper serving of the meals, and counting the messes coming from the kitchen (as a check against the expenses claimed by that department). In the chamber two esquires and their staff performed these duties. The hall was under the direction of two knight marshals and one knight usher, who had duties additional to those mentioned above. When the household was on the move, one of the marshals acted as harbinger,[8] obtaining lodgings for the king and the court. The other marshal[9] and the usher arranged the seating and maintained discipline in the hall, ensured that only those entitled were fed, and made a daily check of the other household offices to prevent the entry of unauthorized persons. One of the marshals, apparently the harbinger marshal,[10] aided the steward of the household in trying offenses committed within the verge of the court.[11] This marshal maintained the prison of the marshalsea in the household and attached and distrained defendants who were to appear before the court of the verge. The offices of the ewery and napery[12] were apparently part of the hall and chamber, while launderers and laundresses seem to have been attached to the napery.

The office of the marshalsea was also responsible for the care and stabling of horses. The clerk of the department accounted for the costs of hay, oats, litter, and medicines bought for the horses, and for the costs of purchasing and repairing saddles, bridles, other harnesses and equipment, and carts. Goods and commodities required by the marshalsea were obtained by a subordinate department, the avenery. The marshalsea also had its own harbingers to find stables for the horses when the household travelled. Household carters, sumptermen, and palfreymen were attached to the marshalsea. The expenses of the marshalsea are recorded under the heading Stabulum (Stable) in the daily household expenses.[13]

In addition to his other duties, the clerk of the marshalsea recorded the names of those household servants entitled to wages who were actually in court. On the basis of this list the daily wages were calculated and recorded under the heading Vadia (Wages) in the Hospicium (Household) expenses.[14] In fact, wages were not paid daily. Instead, the head of the marshalsea made a periodic accounting with household servants, giving them a bill[15] indicating the amount due. This bill could then be cashed in the wardrobe, or, on the wardrobe's authorization, in the exchequer.

Hunters and falconers helped feed the court and provide for Edward's sport, but apparently they were not attached to any specific office, because their duties necessitated their absence from court.[16]

The household contained offices and personnel not concerned with housing and feeding the court, such as the office of the almonry and the king's chapel, as well as the king's confessor, physician, and surgeon. Bannerets, knights, esquires, sergeants-at-arms, and other individuals were attached to the larger chamber organization,[17] which was not a household office, and were in personal attendance on the king. Such men formed the nucleus of the household's military contingent. Finally, there ~~were~~ a number of minstrels who entertained the king.

The major department not concerned with feeding or lodging the court was the wardrobe. Although the wardrobe still stored and cared for the king's clothing and valuables, these were no longer its primary duties, having been superseded partly by the larger chamber. Robes retained in the wardrobe were apparently stored in a subdepartment called the "wardrobe of robes".[18] The principal importance of the wardrobe arose from the fact that it was the administrative and accounting department of the entire household. The wardrobe officers were entrusted with the receipt and expenditure of money in the household and with the drawing up and submitting to the exchequer of the financial accounts of the entire household. The head of this department was called the keeper of the wardrobe; his alternate title of treasurer of the household is infrequently used in the accounts.[19] Below the keeper were the controller and the cofferer.

Both the keeper and the controller were important administrative officers, frequently absent from court. Their duties often devolved upon others. The cofferer could assume the keeper's responsibilities. Originally, the cofferer was the wardrobe cashier, receiving and issuing money. While retaining these duties, he could also perform the keeper's tasks of drawing up the accounts and submitting them for audit, as well as sealing debentures in the keeper's absence. The controller's duties could also be delegated to a clerk, but the precise status of this clerk is not clear. The extent to which the keeper and the controller delegated their work depended largely upon their employment by the king in general administration. Since the wardrobe in the last years of Edward III's reign was primarily concerned with domestic matters, it would seem that the keeper and controller did much of their own work.

Control of the household resided with the steward of the household and the keeper of the wardrobe. Both men checked the accounts of the heads of the various departments. The keeper, who was usually a cleric, was concerned with supervising and auditing the accounts. The steward, who was the supreme head of the household and a layman, seems to have been concerned with maintaining discipline within the household and with the punishment of malefactors. Thus, at the audit before the steward and keeper, it was the steward who punished any slackness or offence in presenting the accounts. In addition, the steward and one of the marshals of the household[20] heard the "pleas of the hall" (placita aule) in the household court known as the court of the marshalsea or the court of the verge.[21] This court could try cases involving breaches of the peace committed within the verge of the court,[22] including those by household servants, cases of debts involving household servants, and cases dealing with contempt of the king's rights of purveyance or lodging. In addition, the court had a permanent but restricted cognizance of cases pending when the king and the court arrived.[23] The steward's judicial role is very little observed in the accounts, since only the total receipt from the court of the marshalsea is recorded,[24] except that the *Recepta Forinseca*[25] reveals that the steward recovered some stolen plate and that the culprit was hanged.

Closely associated with the court of the marshalsea was the coroner of the household, who also acted as clerk of the market. This official had two separate functions.[26] As coroner of the household, he held inquests, with the local coroner, into cases of death within the verge of the court, attaching felons and seizing chattels and goods. The coroner of the household also acted as the steward's controller for the pleas of the hall; he received the money resulting from fines, amercements, and forfeitures, and transmitted it to the wardrobe. As clerk of the market, he had to ensure that the assizes of bread, wine, and ale, and of weights and measures were observed within the verge of the court. Those breaking the assizes were tried before the court of the marshalsea; the resulting profits of the "pleas of the market" (*placita mercati*) were transmitted to the wardrobe by the clerk of the market.

Each household department or office was managed by a clerk, who was a cleric, or by a sergeant, who was a laymen.

Because of the wardrobe's scribal and accounting responsibilities, the chief officials of that department were normally clerics. These department heads supervised the activities of their departments and were required to keep a record of the expenses and receipts of their offices.

Expenditures in the household departments arose from the purchase or purveyance of commodities required. In addition, such carts and horses as were required for the transportation of the household and its goods also could be purveyed. Purveyance refers to the king's prerogative of obtaining, by preemption, victuals and other things for his domestic organization, even against the seller's will.[27] Theoretically, the appraised value of the goods purveyed was to be agreed upon by the vendor and the purveyor before purveyance was made, but complaints often arose because of the manner in which purveyance was made and because the purveyor paid less than market value.[28]

Each department had its own official(s) who acted as purveyor(s). The purveyor could pay the vendor in cash, as was demanded of the office of the poultry, but more commonly payment was by means of a tally, a procedure which raised considerable complaint.[29] A tally was "a stick notched and split through the notches, so that both parties to a transaction may have part of the record".[30] The configuration and size of the notches indicated the total cost of the purchase. On the flat side of both parts of the tally were generally written the names of the seller and buyer, what was purchased, the quantity, its unit price, and the date. The vendor received the larger part of the tally (called the stock); the household buyer retained the smaller portion (called the foil).

Upon his return to the household, the buyer delivered his purchases and the tally foils to his department head, who in turn kept a record of these purchases and passed the tally foils on to the wardrobe. The delivery of the goods normally had to be witnessed by other members of the household staff to ensure that the price paid and the quantity was as claimed, and that the quality of the goods was acceptable.

The stock of the tally acted not only as a receipt, but also as a promissory note or cheque. To receive payment for the items purchased from him, the vendor took the tally stock to the wardrobe. If the stock matched one of the foils received from the department heads, it was redeemed either in cash or, as was more likely, by means of a debenture or bill.[31] A debenture was a strip of parchment containing the creditor's name, the amount owed, and the nature of the debt. For authentication the debenture was also sealed by a wardrobe clerk. These debentures could be redeemed for cash at the exchequer, or because they were negotiable instruments, they could be assigned by the owner to others in return for cash.

As mentioned the steward and keeper audited the accounts kept by the department heads. The heads of those departments responsible for the feeding and lodging of the court were theoretically expected to account for the expenses of their offices at a daily audit, although it is likely that the requirement of a daily accounting was often ignored. However, such departments recorded their expenses on a day by day basis. Presumably, it was at this daily or almost daily accounting that the foils of tallies issued for purveyances were handed to the keeper of the wardrobe. In addition to this daily accounting, the keeper and steward periodically audited the accounts of both the receipts and expenses of all department heads and others who had received and spent money on household business. It was hoped that periodic audits throughout the accounting year would enable the final wardrobe account for the accounting year to be drawn up promptly. However, the complex system of payment fostered by the use of the tally and debenture, whereby goods or services received by the household in one year might not actually be paid for until several years later, made punctuality virtually impossible. Hence, it often took a year or two before the wardrobe account was drawn up and submitted to the exchequer.

The heads of the household departments and offices were personally liable for the expenses of their offices and a similar obligation was imposed on the keeper of the wardrobe for the expenses of the entire household establishment. Since receipts and expenditures were ideally equal, personal liability theoretically was no burden, but there were cases where discrepancies between receipts and expenses arose. Expenditures could be disallowed if proper authorization could not be produced[32] or purchases made by a purveyor could be found inferior in quality and revalued at a lower sum.[33] In such instances, the persons involved were judged to have received more money than actually spent, and so were made personally liable for the difference. Because it was often difficult to obtain payment for purchases or assignments made by tallies, such tallies tended to become devalued, even worthless.[34] Thus, it was possible for an official to have an excess of expenditures over receipts. This personal obligation is best seen in relation to the keeper of the wardrobe. If the exchequer audit showed that the keeper had received more money than he had spent, the difference could be dealt with in two ways. Should the keeper continue in office, the difference was made part of the receipt of the next account. However, if the keepership terminated, then the sum was expected from the keeper, who could be imprisoned until he paid. On the other hand, the exchequer audit could reveal that the keeper had spent more money than received, a difference which was called the superplusagium. When the keeper remained in office, the superplusagium was credited to him in the next account, but if the keepership was over, then the sum was owed the keeper.[35]

The annual wardrobe book presented by the wardrobe to the exchequer for audit was a statement of the money received and expended in the household during the period covered by the account. However, several accounts, but particularly Farley's, have receipts or expenditures which were incurred outside the period of account. Presumably receipts or expenditures which occurred before the accounting period began or which took place after the accounting period had ended but before the audit would be included in the account if such receipts or expenditures were related to some activity which took place during the accounting period. Thus, in Farley's account many of the receipts and expenses which were outside the accounting period deal with expenditures resulting from the campaign in France and the peace negotiations in Calais.

The wardrobe book, composed at the end of the accounting period, was apparently based upon the rolls of expenses and receipts kept by the wardrobe, that is, those records drawn up by the wardrobe as a result of its auditing of departmental expenses and receipts.[36] The wardrobe book does not appear to be based directly upon the records kept by the various departments. The matter can only be one of conjecture since none of the rolls are extant for the last several decades of Edward's III's reign. The preliminary rolls of expenses and receipts kept by the wardrobe seem to have been drawn up in journal form, recording on a day by day basis and under appropriate subheadings the money received and expended. However, in the wardrobe books only expenses directly related to feeding and housing the household are recorded in journal form. All other expenses, as well as receipts, are normally entered in chronological order under appropriate tituli. However, since entries in the various tituli of expenses seem to be based upon a daily journal, it is likely that the dates given in the wardrobe books represent when expenses were actually incurred rather than when payments for them were made. Although there are some exceptions in the accounts under discussion, the present work assumes a dated expense to indicate the day on which the expenditure arose. At the same time it should be noted that some tituli of expenditures, such as those recording war wages, wages of hunters and falconers, and fees and robes, do not record actual payments, but only give the details and costs of services performed or reasons why money was owed certain individuals. As happened with other household creditors, years could pass before such expenses were paid, either by the wardrobe or the exchequer. Whenever payments were made by the exchequer, they formed part of the Recepta Scaccarii.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX I

[1] These offices and their responsibilities and expenses are discussed on pp. 79 ff.

[2] Myers, Black Book, p. 274. See also above, p. 253.

[3] See p. 83.

[4] See pp. 138-41.

[5] For this department see p. 85. This "chamber" was both an office of the king's household and a permanent section of the larger chamber (Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 254, 313), although Tout (ibid., III, p. 56) notes the impossibility of totally distinguishing between the household and the chamber organizations. The close ties between the household and the chamber are seen in the fact that the household paid the costs of wages or fees, food, clothing, and lodging of the chamber staff (see pp. 163, 165, 168 for fees and clothing), while knights attached to the household were called knights of the chamber (see p. 163). During the last 20 years of Edward's reign the larger chamber (Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 312-43) acted as the king's privy purse, paying for his secret, personal, or private expenses, which could include the buying of jewelry, the granting of gifts, or the provision of men and ships for the war effort (ibid., pp. 293-94). The chamber did not account to the exchequer for these disbursements, although it did receive its income from it. The larger chamber also acted as a storehouse for money, including the ransoms of king John of France and the duchy of Burgundy, as well as acting as the storehouse for Edward's valuables, including jewelry and plate. The chamber staff included many of Edward's closest confidants, whose duties ranged from handling Edward's private affairs to directing national administration.

[6] See pp. 85-86.

[7] Tout, "Household Ordinances", Edward II, pp. 281, 283-84.

[8] The harbinger preceded the court and procured and arranged lodging, according to rank, for the king, the court, and members of the household. If the king did not stay on a royal manor, lodging in private homes could be requisitioned and members of the court and household billeted in them.

[9] If the household was stationary, the two marshals alternated in carrying out their duties at the meals.

[10] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 208-10.

[11] See pp. 295-96, and n. 22 below.

[12] The office of the ewery was responsible for bringing the water and bowls so that diners could rinse their hands, while the office of the napery was responsible for the household linen.

[13] See p. 85. The use of the word "stable" does not appear to have been founded upon a distinction between the expenses of feeding and stabling the horses and those of buying and repairing carts and harnesses since, with one exception, the accounts do not record anywhere expenses of the latter type.

[14] See pp. 85-86.

[15] See p. 298.

[16] Their wages are recorded in the Vadia Venatorum et Putura Canum (Wages of Hunters and Food Allowances of Dogs) and the Vadia Falconariorum et Putura Falconum (Wages of Falconers and Food Allowances of Falcons) (see Chapter XII).

[17] See above, n. 5.

[18] Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 181-82, 482-83; and below, pp. 82, 134.

[19] The scope of the wardrobe's responsibilites tended to blur the distinction between the "wardrobe" and the "household". By the last years of Edward's reign, the word "household" finally replaced the word "wardrobe" when describing the king's domestic organization, while the word "wardrobe" was used to describe the great wardrobe (Tout, Chapters, IV, pp. 159-60). For the great wardrobe, see pp. 138-41.

[20] See above, pp. 291-92.

[21] See Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 243, and W. R. Jones, "The Court of the Verge: The Jurisdiction of the

Steward and Marshal of the Household in Later Medieval England", Journal of British Studies, vol. X, no. 1 (1970), p. 1. n. 1.

[22] "The verge of the court is a sphere of 12 miles round either the court or the place where the king resides" (Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 243 n.1).

[23] See Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 243-44, and Jones, "The Court of the Verge", pp. 1-29.

[24] See below and p. 44.

[25] See p. 49. The Vessellamenta also states that a person was hanged for stealing plate (see p. 266).

[26] See Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 245-48, and Jones, "The Court of the Verge", pp. 19-20.

[27] See Bray, "The Office of Purveyor", pp. 329-62, especially 331-42.

[28] See Bray, "The Office of Purveyor", pp. 339-44; Chalfant Robinson, "Royal Purveyance in Fourteenth-Century England in Light of Simon of Islip's Speculum Regis", Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1910, pp. 91-99; and G. L. Harriss, King, Parliament, and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 376-79.

[29] Bray, "The Office of Purveyor", pp. 339, 340-41.

[30] Charles H. Jenkinson, "Exchequer Tallies", Archaeologia, vol. LXII (1911), p. 367.

[31] See p. 58 for the only example of this procedure in the accounts.

[32] See, for example, pp. 253-54.

[33] See p. 146.

[34] Steel, Receipt of the Exchequer, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

[35] Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", p. 235, and Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward I", pp. 50-51. See also above, p. 146 and Appendix II.

[36] These rolls and the method of entering items are discussed by Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward I", pp. 60-64; Johnson, "Wardrobe of Edward II", pp. 84-87, 101; and Johnson, "Wardrobe and Household", pp. 218-20, 233-34.

APPENDIX II

THE HOUSEHOLD'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

The various tituli of receipts and expenditures are recorded in the following tables. All the accounts but Wakefield's strike a balance at the end of the accounting year; all the related exchequer enrolled accounts strike a balance. The enrollments indicate that Farley, Brantingham, and Beverley were eventually paid the balance in their favour (that is, the superplusagium). The respective debits and credits of Gunthorpe and Wakefield were applied to their succeeding accounts.

For the most part the arithmetic in the accounts is accurate, although there are a number of errors. Some seem to have been scribal in nature. For example, the total expenditure on folio 33r of Gunthorpe's Dona is given as £8 13s.11d., but in the lower right hand corner there is also written £8 3s.11d. In fact, the latter is the correct sum; this figure was used to obtain the final titulus expense.

Some mistakes either were made or apparently overlooked by the auditors. For example, on the last folio (78r) of Farley's Feoda et Robe the final entry was written by a hand other than the one that drew up the account. The expense recorded in this entry was not added to the folio or the titulus totals. In addition, the item itself contains a definite error. Two men each received winter robes valued at 26s.8d., but the expenditure recorded is only 33s.4d. The final folio (49r) of Gunthorpe's Vadia Venatorum contains only two entries. The first shows that a hunter received wages for himself at 1 1/2d. per day and food allowances of 3/4d. each per day for 6 greyhounds for a total of 17 days. The total expense is 8s.6d., but, for some reason, the expenditure recorded in the account was erased. The second entry reveals that 3 men each received wages of 1 1/2d. per day and 3/4d. each per day for 18 greyhounds for 13 days. The expenditure is correctly given as 19s.6d. The total expenditure of these entries should have amounted to 28s., but the sum recorded is 28s.6 1/2d.

TABLE VI

FARLEY'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES

Receipts:	£	s.	d.
Recepta Scaccarii	108,624	5	7 1/2
Recepta Forinseca	20,743	16	3/4
Debita per Billas*.	30,386	17	7 3/4
Debita sine Billis*	917		3
Debita per Tallias*	127	14	8 1/4
Total	160,799	14	3 1/4
Expenses:			
Hospicium	8,554	6	1/2
Elemosina	328	8	11
Necessaria	6,159	14	1
Vadia Falconariorum	863	19	5 1/4
Dona	3,259	17	8 3/4
Nuncii	10	9	10
Feoda et Robe	1,293	10	8
Vadia Guerre	133,820	16	6 1/2
Vadia Pacis	431		9 1/4
Prestita	6,897	15	8**
Total	161,619	19	8 1/4***
Farley's superplusagium	820	5	5 ***

---

*Tout, Chapters, VI, pp. 90-91, does not include, or make reference to, these debts.

**The enrollment reads £6,897 15s.4d.

***The enrollment reads 4d. less for the total expense and the superplusagium.

TABLE VII

GUNTHORPE'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES

Receipts:	£	s.	d.
Recepta Scaccarii	18,472	3	5
Recepta Forinseca	10,688	17	1/2
*Debita**	40		
Total	29,201		5 1/2
Expenses:			
Hospicium	17,545	4	10
Elemosina	148	3	8**
Dona	493	4	1
Nuncii	30	17	3
Necessaria	4,068	17	5
Vadia Venatorum	100	7	1/2
Vadia Falconariorum	245	8	5
Feoda et Robe	289	8	8***
Prestita et Remanencia	4,133	11	3 1/2
Total	27,055	2	8#
Balance owed by Gunthorpe . .	2,145	17	9 1/2#

---

*Tout, *Chapters*, VI, pp. 92-93, does not include, or make reference to, this debt.

**The enrolled account reads £148 3s.

***The enrolled accounts reads £304 19d., a sum also given in the wardrobe book, but not as the *titulus* total. Addition of the page total yields £289 8s.8d.

#Because of the discrepancies mentioned in the previous notes, the total expense is £14 12s.11d. higher in the enrollment than in the wardrobe book, while the balance owed in the enrollment is lesser by a similar amount than that in the wardrobe book.

TABLE VIII

YPRES' RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES

	£	s.	d.
Receipts:			
Recepta Scaccarii	3,779	10	4 1/2
Recepta Forinseca	5,903	3	10 1/2
Total	9,682	14	3
Expenses:			
Hospicium	4,435	2	7 1/2
Elemosina	152	9	8
*Vessellamenta Argenti**. . . .	200	13	9
*Necessaria**	505	6	1/2
*Empcio Equorum**.	9	6	8
*Restaurum Equorum**.	12		
Feoda et Robe	181	13	4
Calciatura	22	19	8
Calciatura vallettorum Regine	9	4	
Dona	129	3	6
Nuncii	10	18	4
Vadia Venatorum	40	1	8 1/4**
Vadia Falconariorum	128	7	1/2***
Prestita et Remanencia . . .	3,994	14	1 1/4
Total	9,742		5#
Brantingham's *superplusagium*	59	6	2#

---

*These four *tituli* add to £727 6s.5 1/2d., £1 more than the sum given in the enrollment.

**The sum in the enrolled account is £39 3s.4 1/2d.

***No sum is given in the enrolled account.

#Because of the discrepancies mentioned in the previous notes, the total expense and the *superplusagium* are £1 18s.4d. higher in the wardrobe book than in the enrollment.

TABLE IX

WAKEFIELD'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES

Receipts:	£	s.	d.
Recepta Scaccarii	31,003	14	1 1/2
Recepta Forinseca	6,490	13	4 1/4
Total	37,494	7	5 3/4
Expenses (first year):			
Hospicium	13,876	2	3 1/2
Elemosina	389	1	5 1/2
Necessaria	1,702	3	5 3/4
Empcio Equorum	1,276	4	2
Restaurum Equorum	30		
Feoda et Robe	544		12
Dona	426	13	11 1/2
Nuncii	18	2	4
Vadia Venatorum	60	18	8 1/2
Vadia Falconariorum	187	8	2 1/2
Vadia Guerre	97	12	4
Total	18,608	7	11 1/4
Expenses (second year):			
Hospicium	13,747	11	7
Elemosina	399	18	3
Necessaria	1,408	9	1
Restaurum Equorum	20		
Feoda et Robe	547	4	
Dona	527		12 1/2
Nuncii	11	6	
Vadia Venatorum	46	1	7 1/4
Vadia Falconariorum	222	17	1 1/2
Prestita	1,680		7
Remanencia	2,838	8	3
Total	21,448	17	6 1/4
Total expenses for both years	40,057	5	5 1/2
[Wakefield's *superplusagium* .	2,562	17	11 3/4]

TABLE X

BEVERLEY'S RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES

Receipts	£	s.	d.
Recepta Scaccarii	7,885	19	4
Recepta Forinseca*	3,643	6	5 3/4
Debentur*	1,805	18	6 1/2
Total	13,335	4	4 1/4
Expenses:			
Hospicium	9,046	18	4 1/2
Elemosina	1,177	11	10 1/2
Necessaria	906	9	4 1/2
Empcio Equorum	79	6	8
Restaurum Equorum	14		
Feoda et Robe	519		4
Dona	59	18	4
Nuncii	3	13	4
Vadia Venatorum	23	19	7 1/4
Vadia Falconariorum	181	16	2 1/2
Prestita	1,325	7	3
Total	13,338	1	4 1/4
Beverley's superplusagium	2	17	

---

*Tout, *Chapters*, VI, pp. 94-95, records the value of the *Recepta Forinseca* as being £5,449 5s. 1/4d. without mentioning that it include the debts.